



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

*A HISTORY OF
ARMENIAN CHRISTIANITY*

Other books by Leon Arpee

THE ARMENIAN AWAKENING

THE ATONEMENT
IN EXPERIENCE

A CENTENNIAL VOLUME
MARKING THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY
OF ARMENIAN PROTESTANTISM, 1846-1946

A HISTORY OF
**Armenian
Christianity**

from the Beginning to Our Own Time



By Leon Arpee

1946
THE ARMENIAN MISSIONARY ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA, INC.
152 EAST 34th STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Copyright, 1946, by The Armenian Missionary Association of America, Inc.
Designed and Printed in the United States of America
By Princeton University Press at Princeton, New Jersey

TO
THE MEMORY OF
HIS GRANDMOTHER
SIRPÜE NERGARARIAN
1824-1906
AND
HIS FATHER
THE REV. STEPAN TCHORIGIAN
1847-1913
AND
HIS MOTHER
TACÜE N. TCHORIGIAN
1862-1943
PIONEERS ALL
OF THE GOSPEL
WHO LABORED TOGETHER
THROUGH THE YEARS
IN BITHYNIA
AND
CONSTANTINOPLE
THIS VOLUME IS
AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED
BY
THE AUTHOR

PUBLISHER'S NOTICE

AMONG the interests of the Armenian Missionary Association of America, Inc., is that of publication. During a history going so far back only as the year 1918, this Association has brought out religious pamphlets and periodical bulletins, and recently has begun publishing a monthly Magazine, but the present volume is its first publication in book form.

This is the first of a series of books the Publication Board plans and is authorized to publish in commemoration of an important date. On the first day of July, in 1846, a group of men and women broke off from the Mother Church of Armenia and organized themselves into an independent religious body, known originally as the Evangelical Church of Armenia, marking thus the formal beginning of the Protestant Church among the Armenians of Turkey, the native land then of the vast majority of the Armenian people and so continuing until the fateful year of 1915.

A century has since elapsed. July 1, 1946, therefore is a day of momentous significance for at least that portion of the Armenian people who, generation after generation, for a period of a hundred years, have received their religious nurture through the Armenian Evangelical Church.

The fascinating story of the struggles and accomplishments of the Evangelical Movement among us is concisely told within the space of two chapters of this volume, and will be told at greater length and in fuller detail in a forthcoming book by the same Author to be published as the Second Volume in this series of Centennial Publications.

We are happy indeed to be able to offer to the public this HISTORY OF ARMENIAN CHRISTIANITY, in which is so evident the patient and fruitful industry of its learned Author. Our gratitude is owing to him first of all; and next to MR. HARUTUNE NERGARARIAN, who by a generous gift aids in the publication of this work, prompted as he is by a worthy desire to honor the memory of all those faithful servants of the Lord who, like his own Father and the Author's have preached and ministered among us by the Light and Spirit of the Gospel of Christ.

A. A. BEDIKIAN,
Executive Secretary,
Armenian Missionary Association
of America.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

PREFATORY NOTE

A HIGHLAND region lying between the Black and Caspian Seas to the north, and the Mediterranean to the southwest, Armenia, by virtue of its geographical position, has been throughout the ages the meeting-point of empires. Through this region the cross-currents of races, the tides of invasion, have ever ebbed and flowed, of Assyrians, Scythians and Alani, Bulgars and Huns, Khazars and Georgians, Persians, Macedonians, Romans and Byzantines, Arabs, Tatars, Turks, Franks and Russians. The people therefore who lived in this little country were destined to have relations, hostile or friendly, secular or religious, with the whole world.

Armenian Christianity has not been devoid of originality and world significance. The frontiersmen of Christendom, this people loved simplicity and freedom. The place and mission of their Church in the Christian world may be thus characterized: (1) In doctrine the Armenian Church has been careful to define its faith in the true Deity of Christ in his person and work, but ever consistently has declined to fix details of dogma beyond that; (2) this doctrinal attitude has made the Church quite tolerant of all orthodox Churches, and equally intolerant of any pretensions or interference on their part, throughout the centuries the Armenian Church maintaining the principle of national churches, within the Great Church, that of a federation of churches, rather than one Universal Church governed from a single center; (3) the Armenians always have jealously guarded the rights of the people in the government and life of the Church, the Bishops of the Armenian Church, from the Catholicos down, never except in times of disorganization having had absolute powers, and the clergy, from the highest primate to the lowest parish priest having been subject to the choice of the people.

Perhaps this book will raise in the reader's mind the question whether Catholic Christendom, East or West, ever has extended toward Armenian Christianity that measure of sincere goodwill and understanding which should have been its due, and conversely whether the Armenian Church's old-time suspicion of ecumenical Christendom, its independency, that is, and its jealous nationalism,

so inconsistent apparently with its own avowed catholicity of spirit, have not on the whole been justified. In any case, Armenians who have thought that Protestantism itself among them was an indigenous growth owing next to nothing to foreign influences, should be led by a reading of this book to see that their Christianity in any of its forms never was a thing independent of ecumenical Christianity, while on the other hand, readers of Western connections, too long, as has been said, "culpably ignorant" of it, on that very ground might discern a rightful claim of Armenian Christianity upon their own serious attention and study.

Such a work as the present, it is believed, has long been a desideratum of Church History. Ormanian's monumental work, and Chamchean's equally important History even in Avdall's English translation are hardly accessible. Besides they both are written from the prelatical point of view, the first mainly the Armenian, the second the Roman, and both deficient in many of their critical judgments. Of course it is impossible to write history without a bias. Nor, provided the historian aims to be impartial, is it desirable. For a historian's bias is his viewpoint. It should be of some value that the present work is written frankly from the evangelical or Protestant viewpoint. Certainly this in itself no longer need be deemed a defect. For the time has gone by when it was not possible for a Protestant to bring to his task a sympathetic understanding of the tenets and usages of a Patristic Church like the Armenian which on general principles he must deem objectionable, namely, its stationary and inexpansive views of Christian doctrine in good part explained by an agelong conflict with Unitarianism within and without the Church (Paulicianism and Islam), its veneration of saints and relics serving to create in the popular imagination a sense of historic continuity such as the Protestant pulpit seeks to cultivate through occasional historical and biographical discourses, and its system of penances affording a ready made and practical test of the sincerity of penitents for the convenience of a clergy not always adequately equipped for the care of souls.

The writer whose active life has been spent entirely in the pastorate in the United States, far from the old libraries of Europe and the Near East, fain would have yielded the task of

preparing this volume to one of better residential qualifications. He only hopes that other equipment brought to it may have compensated in some measure for his handicap. Such as it is, the book owes its very existence in large measure to the long and patient co-operation of one, now past these earthly scenes, who stood to the author closer than in the relation of teacher or friend. For thirty years City Missionary under the American Board Mission at Constantinople, my Father was able to collect for me all sorts of indispensable publications, some new, others old and rare, from the world over. To Professor F. W. Buckler, of the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, who read the book in manuscript, I am indebted for valued criticism and suggestions. Thanks are also due to Professor F. W. Loetscher, of the Princeton Theological Seminary, who ascertained for me the correct date, crucial in Armenian Church History, of a certain Edict of Justinian, as explained in my Notes.

It has not seemed best to multiply references to the Armenian sources and authorities accessible to a few scholars. Hence the number of notes at the end of the book also has been kept down to a minimum. The Bibliography is for collateral reading, a few titles alone excepted, by the average English reader. A working list of the ancient Armenian sources will be found in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Eleventh Edition, in the Article on *Armenian Language and Literature*. The Tenth Chapter appeared in issues of December, 1943, of the New York *Armenian Mirror-Spectator*; the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Chapters in the December, 1944, *Church History*, and the Twenty-First and Twenty-Second Chapters in the June, 1936, issue of the same Quarterly, and all, with some changes, are here reproduced by the kind permission of the Editors of those publications. I have avoided any unnecessary repetition of matter in *The Armenian Awakening*, 1909, relating to the Paulicians and the modern Protestants. A considerable number of critical points specialists will readily recognize have been determined by first-hand research, results, however, rather than processes being given. In the transliteration of proper names no scientific scheme, so-called, has been followed, such schemes usually being needlessly offensive to the eye. All translations from the Armenian, in text and Appendix, are my own.

Special thanks are due the Armenian Missionary Association of America, Inc., who have adopted this work for a Centennial Volume, assuming all financial responsibilities involved, and in particular to its honored Treasurer, my cousin, Harutune Nergararian, for a personal contribution as generous as it is public-spirited.

CONTENTS

I. PRE-CHRISTIAN RELIGION	I
II. THE CONVERSION OF ARMENIA	9
III. TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE	24
IV. THE ARMENIAN BIBLE: A CRITIQUE	33
V. THE STRUGGLE WITH PERSIA	44
VI. THE EARLY DOCTRINAL WRITERS	58
VII. THE ARAB DOMINATION	75
VIII. HIGH CONTRASTS	90
IX. THE PAULICIANS	101
X. BEGINNINGS OF INDEPENDENCY	120
XI. CONTROVERSIES AND OVERTURES	131
XII. PAPAL INTRIGUES	149
XIII. THE LATER DEVOTIONAL WRITERS	165
XIV. GREGORY OF DATEV AND THE ARMENIAN <i>Summa</i>	175
XV. THE CHURCH AND THE TIMES	187
XVI. RAVAGED ARMENIA	204
XVII. DUSK AND DAWN	214
XVIII. CONDITIONS ABROAD	224
XIX. HARBINGERS OF A NEW DAY	238
XX. THE PAPAL DEFECTION	252
XXI. THE EVANGELICAL MOVEMENT	266
XXII. ITS SIGNIFICANCE	279
XXIII. THE GREAT TRIBULATION	293
XXIV. THE ARMENIAN CHARACTER	309
<i>APPENDICES</i>	
I. AN EPISTLE OF GREGORY OF NAREG ON THE PAULICIANS	319
II. TRACTATE OF JOHN OF OTZUN AGAINST THE PHANTASIASTAE	325
III. CHARTER OF CHRISTIANS IN PERSIA	355
IV. A ROLL OF MODERN MARTYRS	361
NOTES	367
BIBLIOGRAPHY	371
INDICES	379

CHAPTER I

PRE-CHRISTIAN RELIGION

THE ancient Hittites, shortly after the middle of the second millennium Before Christ, knew a land lying to the north-east of their empire which they called Haiasa. This has always been the native name for Armenia, the Armenians calling themselves Haik. Apparently, however, the Armenian people, like the Anglo-Saxons, are the progeny of two main stocks, the more ancient Haik, and the later-arriving Armens, by which last name foreigners have come to know this people. The Armens are attributed by Herodotus, in the fifth century Before Christ, a Phrygian origin. They seem to have come from Thrace, taking several centuries in making their transit across the length of Asia Minor. But so early as 800 years Before Christ they already are in the vicinity of the Vannic kingdom, a rock inscription of King Minuas of Urardhu at Melitene (Malatia), dated about that time, mentioning them as a people distinct from his own.

The Armenian language, containing as it does diverse words from all of the Indo-European tongues old and new, would seem to support the myth that the Armenians speak the original language of man before the confusion of tongues. With the Vedic Indian, the Armenian says *cark*, for car or wagon; with the Old Persian *dastag*, for hand; with the Greek *gyn*, for woman; with the Latin *nav*, for ship; with the Celt *zur*, for water; with the Frenchman *shun*, for dog; with the Scot *tun*, for house; with the Slav *das*, for ten; with the Goth *ber*, for bear or bring; with the German *agn*, for eye, and with the Englishman *caam*, *mees*, *her* and *dur*, for come, meat, hair and door respectively.

The language bears distinct traces of the old Aryan cults. The name for the first month of the Armenian calendar, *Navassart*, is the Sanskrit *Nava Sarada* (New Year's). The common Armenian name for God, *Asdvadz*, like the Pehlevi *Asdvadt*, has cognates in the Sanskrit, *Asdvadta* and *Svadat*. *Div*, Armenian for Day, reflects the Sanskrit *Dyaus*, the Celtic *Duez*, and the Latin *Dies* and *Deus*. As deities of an older faith have a way of becoming the devils of a newer cult, so the *Devas* of the older Vedic religion in

course of time become the *Devs* (devils) of the later Persian and Armenian Zoroastrianism.

Primitive Religion

Apparently the Armenians, like other peoples, originally were animists and nature-worshippers, even as the late Armenian saga shows.

In travail was heaven and earth,
 In travail, too, the azure sea!
 The travail held fast in the sea the reedlet red.
 Through the reed-pipe came forth smoke,
 Through the reed-pipe came forth flame,
 And through the flame a laddie ran!
 Fiery hair had he,
 Ay, too, he had flaming whiskers,
 And his eyes were twin suns!

So sang the Goghtn bards or troubadours, of Vahagn, third or fourth in descent from Tigranes I, contemporary of Cyrus of Persia, a thousand years after their hero's time. But what in this verse challenges our attention is not so much whether we have here portrayed the birth of an Armenian Hercules or sun deity, as that Vahagn comes forth out of the reed along the margin of the sea.

The instance is not a solitary one in literature. Frazer gives a Pelew equivalent in prose, in the myth of Horgim, the God of War.¹ The Zulus of Africa have much the same sort of myth of their Adam or Demiurge. "Who made you?" asks the missionary of a young Zulu. "Unkulunkulu (Great-Great)," is the reply. "Where did Unkulunkulu come from?" "He sprang from a reed on the river's brink."² Nor is it heroes and demigods alone that so originate. According to the old Babylonian creation myth, the common people also are thus brought into being.

Marduk bound a structure of reeds upon
 the face of the waters,
 He formed dust, he poured it out beside
 the reed structure.

To cause the gods to dwell in the habitation
of their hearts' desire,
He formed mankind.³

Among the Basutos a reed tied over a hut announces the birth of a child.⁴ The notion is universal, being native to the islands of the Pacific, to Africa, ancient Babylonia and Armenia, and is reflected in certain customs of Burma and of Germany.

True to their Aryan antecedents the primitive Armenians had a predilection for sacred trees, notably the oak and the poplar, which survived into the higher cults. Sometimes they practised polygamy, and under more settled conditions maintained large patriarchal households, characteristic of Aryan races and notably the Slavs. In rural regions this institution has survived down to our own time. The Armenians burned or buried their dead, and upon their kings' graves sacrificed the royal widows and servants, as at the obsequies of King Artashes I (114-89 B.C.), whose favorite horses and dogs even were slain.

Khaltis, Mithra and Anahita

Shalmaneser III in the ninth century Before Christ invaded the Kingdom of Urardhu with no great success. In the following century Sarduris II of Urardhu was able to conquer the Commagene, and call himself King of Syria. With a turn of fortune, however, Tiglath-Pileser II in 739-35 B.C. invaded Armenia and Media. Under Sargon II, in 719-18, and again in 716-12, the Assyrians penetrated the land of Urardhu, in the last invasion overthrowing King Rusas and annexing his territories. The south of Armenia thus being under Assyrian domination, it is quite plain why the unnatural sons of Sennacherib in 682 B.C. fled for safety to *northern* Armenia, and the Land of Ararat (2 Kings 19:37). Meantime with the fall of Carchemish, in 717, the last vestiges of the ancient Hittite empire were destroyed.

By 545 B.C. the whole of Asia Minor had become a part of the Persian Empire. Southern Armenia in those days was known as Khaltia, from its chief God Khaltis. We have Xenophon's authority for it that Cyrus, in the second half of the sixth century Before Christ, to us best known as the time of the Jewish Cap-

tivity, terminated the border fights between Armenians and Khaltians, and encouraged the amalgamation of the two peoples through intermarriage. By the time of the trilingual Behistun Inscription of Darius Hystaspis (520 B.C.), ancient Urardhu has come to be known as Armenia.

Mithra worship during this period seems to have displaced the cult of Khaltis, a result in which the Armenians must have had a distinct hand. An ancient Aryan God, Mithra both antedated and survived Zoroastrianism. His cult once extended the whole way from Asia Minor to India. So early as 1350 B.C. "Mitra" is a god of the Mitannians. The rise of Zoroastrianism put him for a time in the shade; but he came back. The home of the deity in Armenia was at Pacarij, in the province of Terjan, south of the modern Erzurum. The cult of the god, the Invincible Sun, is attested by artifacts turned up by the archaeologist's spade, at Van, among others brass ornamental figures, human-headed spread-eagles, possibly symbolizing the highest of the seven of Mithraic secret orders or degrees, objects the Armenian Alishan is puzzled to explain. Armenian Mithra worship has left also its deposit of personal names, *Mihran* and *Mihridates*, still much in common use.

The great divinity of Armenia, however, was not Mithra, but his female consort Anahita, tutelary deity of the land, goddess of childbirth, fertility, and the life-giving waters of heaven, in the land eminently of mountain streams and lakes. Darius Hystaspis is given the credit of having introduced the goddess into Armenia. Artaxerxes II, Mnemon (404-359), placed Mithra and Anahita together alongside of Ahura Mazda, and erected statues of Anahita in all his capitals and principal cities, namely, Babylon, Susa and Ecbatana, Damascus, Sardis and Persepolis. Together, Mithra and Anahita formed the counterpart of Attis and Cybele in Asia Minor, and of Shamash and Ishtar in Babylon. In a word Anahita was Armenia's Mother-Nature Goddess, like Cybele of the Phrygians, like Diana of the Ephesians, like the more recent Mayaguil of the Mexicans.

Anahita's main temple was situated in the district of Egeliatz, Strabo's Acilisene, at Eriza, on the Lycus, tributary of the Euphrates. There also was set up the crescent-crowned statue of

Artemis, captured from the Greeks. A second temple of Anahita was at Armavira, the old capital south of the modern Etchmiadzin, whence afterward the statue of the goddess was removed to the new capital of Artaxata. At the last-named city, just outside of the temple, were extensive pasture lands for the torch-branded Mithraic cows kept for sacrifice. Here once a year, on the 15th of the first month of the Armenian calendar, great festivities were held, the statue of the goddess carried in state about the temple grounds to the accompaniment of song, followed by secular celebrations when marriages were consummated and temple prostitution practised as at Eriza. Similar cults of Anahita prevailed in Pontus, at Zela and Comana.

Astlik (Stella) was Armenia's most *popular* goddess. In course of time assimilated to the Babylonian Ishtar, she was accordingly demoralized. Tigranes III, surnamed the Great (95-56 B.C.), is said to have placed a captured Greek statue of Aphrodite alongside of hers, indicating her western affinities. At the end of the Armenian year, during the "intercalary days," the people made jointly to her and to Anahita, to whom she was a sort of lady-in-waiting, offerings of roses, and dashed water in each other's faces, a practice widely prevalent in Europe also. Astlik's original home was just east of the modern Mush; she also had a temple at Artemid, in the vicinity of Van. But her main temple was at Ashtishat, southeast of Etchmiadzin.

Zoroastrianism

Geographical propinquity and racial and dynastic ties naturally brought Persian Zoroastrianism early into Armenia. The faith appears to have been much older than Zoroaster, who therefore was a reformer of it rather than the founder. He flourished between 600 and 522 B.C., and was buried at the town of his birth, near Urumia. At the age of thirty he was living on the borders of Persia and India, where in a cave he wrote in the ancient Bactrian tongue the *Avesta*, meaning certainties, or realities. This body of literature has come down to us in fragmentary form in the later Pehlevi tongue. Impeded in its progress in the East by Brahmanism and Confucianism, the faith made better head-

way in the West. The prophet himself did not live to see its spread, being killed in battle with the Turanian Scythians.

Originally a monotheistic faith, Zoroastrianism in time became di-theistic, and eventually polytheistic. One of its outstanding practices was the worship of the Sun, in which one detects Mithraic influence and a parallel to the religion of ancient Egypt. Valarses (Balash), founder of the Arsacide dynasty of Armenia, in the second century Before Christ, erected in his capital of Armavira temples wherein he set up statues to the Sun and Moon, showing that at that time those luminaries were worshipped in human form. As we find it in later Christian times Zoroastrianism is on the corrupt Zervanite pattern, making a lame attempt to mitigate the original dualism, and highly ritualistic. In its earlier days it represented a rather lofty ethical ideal, surpassing that of the Greeks. That indeed cannot have been an inferior type of religion that in the late second century Before Christ took in the starving Bulgars hanging on the northern borders of Armenia, and fed and sent them away rejoicing.

The conquest of Armenia by Alexander the Great would seem to have exerted no radical influence on the religion of the country. In the exchange of religions in those days it was not the West that had anything to give.⁵ During the Seleucid occupation some of the Gathas of the Avesta were translated into Greek; but the Greek gods were simply assimilated to the Armenian and renamed. Thus Zeus became Aramazd (Ahura Mazda), Artemis, the Diana of the Romans, became Anahita, Aphrodite was renamed Astlik, and Hercules Vahagn. The principal temple of Zeus or Aramazd was at Fort Ani, the modern Kemakh, not to be confused with the mediaeval Armenian capital on the Akhurian (Arpachai) River. There Artashes II (34-20 B.C.) appointed his own son, Majan, chief priest of Zeus, and there the sanctuary stood until Gregory the Illuminator at the dawn of the fourth century destroyed it, setting its site apart by royal edict for a Christian church. Even down to Gregory's time the priests of pagan Armenia were a powerful feudal caste. In addition to direct gifts from worshippers they received sometimes as much as one-fifth of the spoils of war, had vast estates and their own standing armies, and were exempt from taxation and from military service.

Survivals

Armenian life and culture have had their share of the world's survivals of paganism, though for obvious reasons the celebration of December 25, Birthday of Mithra, Sol Invictus, for Christmas, is not one of them. The midsummer Rose Festival, originally the property of Anahita and Astlik, is now dedicated to the memory of our Lord's Transfiguration, Anahita's character as a water deity rendering it unnecessary to link up the festival as in the West with John the Baptist. The "orientation" of churches, quite common in the West, and perhaps equally an inheritance from the cult of Mithra, is particularly emphasized in Armenia. *Megrdutiun*, the Armenian for baptism, which has proved so difficult to lexicographers, appears also to have a Mazdaean origin, *mokurt*, the word for dedicatory gifts to the Parsee mok or Magian, very naturally being transferred to the Christian dedicatory rite. Armenian exegetes have found the *Narod*, a thread spun of red and white strands, placed on subjects at baptisms and marriages, somewhat of an enigma. They will go so far only as to say that the red and the white represent the blood and the water. But why the thread at all? One answers his own question when told that, like the Hebrew circumcision which now is known to have analogues among many races, the *narod* is used by Parsees and Brahmans of India, and by the Veddas of Ceylon.⁶ The blood sacrifices, for which the Armenians have been taken to task as Judaizers, are candidly confessed to be no sacrifices at all, but offerings for the poor, a relic from the most ancient pre-Christian times. The old Aryan, notably Prussian, snake-worship, too, has left its mark in numerous place-names. The snake figures in several tales of Armenia's conversion not dissimilar to those of St. Patrick in Ireland, and St. George the Dragon-Killer. The superstitious fear of the snake survives in some places where country folk upon finding one in the house will try, rather than kill it, to coax it to leave the premises with soft persuasive words of speech. Nor does anyone know how old are some of the common superstitions of our day, such as that the 31st day of August is a good one on which to extract teeth, or that it is unlucky to drink out of an open vessel on the night

of the 29th of December, when sprites spew into it the germs of insanity. Such lucky and unlucky days led those believing in them to prognostications, auguries, enchantments, necromancy, astrology, magic and witchcraft. Says Cumont: "The Persian Mysteries are not free from the grave reproach of having condoned, if not of having really taught, these various superstitions. And the title *Magus* became in the popular mind, not without good reason, a synonym for *magician*."

Like the Greeks and other races the Armenians had their fabled genii and monsters. They believed in a death or *recording angel*, and to this day when some housewife would vent execration, she likely will say, "May the Recorder take it!" The *baik* (plural), suggesting shamanistic associations, were creatures somewhat of the order of the Greek Pan, with the body of a man, and the legs and horns of a goat. The *al* was the spirit of the hollow place or abyss, hell of the Goth and the Teuton, and the enemy of unborn children who like the Teutonic Hilda, carries off infants dying unchristened whose wails may be heard by mothers in the moaning of the winds on a cold winter night! The *arlez* is a mythical dog of war that licks men killed in battle back to life, a superstition very ancient and long surviving into the Christian era. And finally there are the *braves*, who were sinister spirits dwelling in rocky waste places. By them the first Artashes pronounced a curse upon his unworthy son, Artavastes, consigning him to a perpetual banishment in the dark altitudes of Mt. Masis (Ararat). Artavastes perishes in the craggy heights of the mountain undiscovered, and the ancient bards represent him bound with strong chains which his two faithful hounds incessantly lick down to set him free. Hundreds of years afterward Armenian blacksmiths every Sunday beat their anvils twice or thrice perchance to strengthen the chains for another week to prevent the banished soul's return to the earth again to destroy it.

CHAPTER II

THE CONVERSION OF ARMENIA

THE conversion of Armenia was not an event but a process. Tradition states that Thaddeus, one of the Seventy, and Bartholomew, the Apostle, were the founders, the first of southern, the second of northern, Armenian Christianity, and names their successors in the episcopal oversight of Armenia. The period of their labors is commonly placed at 35-60 A.D. Upon the reputed mission of these pioneers of the faith, the Armenian Church bases its claim to apostolicity.

To us it is of minor consequence who carried Christianity to Armenia, if it was carried, for after all Christianity is not propagated by physical contacts but by the dissemination of ideas. The witness of the older Church writers confirms the general tradition of an early diffusion of Christianity in the land. From Tertullian we learn that there were Christians in Armenia before the middle of the third century, and from Eusebius that about the year 254 A.D. the Armenians had a Bishop by the name of Merujan to whom Dionysius of Alexandria addressed a letter.

Three great persecutions are on record, the first under Artashes, about 110 A.D., a second under Khosrov, about 230, and the last under Tiridates, from 287 until about the year 301, when Christianity by royal edict was made the state religion.

Character of Early Armenian Christianity

It is an interesting question what sort of Christianity that was which spread over Armenia in the first three centuries. There is good reason to believe that it was neither "orthodox" nor "apostolic." Conybeare has plausibly argued that it was Ebionitic or Judaistic in its character,⁸ a theory to which the presence of a large colony of Jews from early times also lends color. If that be true, Adoptionism was the particular form which it assumed.

This heresy in the early Christian centuries was widespread. So early as 190 A.D., Theodotus, the Adoptionist, was anathematized at Rome, where, in the middle of the following century we find the heresy showing its head again in the person of Artemas.

In the year 269 A.D., Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch and Adoptionist leader is condemned by a Synod of his opponents. Under the name of Pauliani, his followers were anathematized by the Council of Nicaea in 325. Another representative of the heresy, Photinus by name, was condemned by the Synods of Milan, 345 and 347, for teaching that Christ was only a man who by his life achieved divine dignity. In the fourth century the heresy counted among its votaries one no less distinguished than the youthful Augustine, and lingered down into the twelfth and thirteenth centuries among the Cathari and the Albigenses of the West.

Armenia did not escape it. During the reign of the Catholicos Isaac I (387-439), a contemporary of Augustine, there appear in northwest Armenia, in the very region that in later centuries becomes noted as a hotbed of Adoptionism, certain sectaries whom Atticus, Bishop of Constantinople, advised the Armenians to convert or expel. Apparently they formed a strong and established sect, older than the new orthodoxy. That they suffered some persecution is apparent from the fact that soon they emigrated in considerable numbers to Syria, where they would have found easy asylum among fellow adoptionists and Nestorians. Isaac's lieutenant, Mesrop, who at this time labored in the eastern districts of Armenia, also plainly had two classes of dissenters to deal with, pagans whom he drove out of the region without difficulty, and Christian heretics whom he did not find it quite so easy to uproot.

The Armenians call this early heresy Messalianism (*mdzghneutiun*), which is the Syrian equivalent of the Greek Euchites (praying people). These same heretics were also known as Borboritae, designated by this name by Epiphanius of Cyprus. The term was an opprobrious epithet, meaning lovers of mire or filth, and like the Armenian *mdzghneutiun* conveying the implication of sodomy, a vice attached by later popular malice to the Bogomiles of Bulgaria. The Borboritae were reputed to be mendicant devotees of both sexes, who wandered about homeless, and slept promiscuously in the streets by night.

It is significant that a contemporary Armenian writer finds for the early Armenian heretics no name at all. This writer, Lazar

of Pharbee, who lived during the catholicate of John Mandakuni, toward the end of the fifth century, has a letter, now extant, addressed to the prince of the time, Vahan Mamigonian, in which he states that Armenian heresy is nondescript, being neither Arianism, Apollinarianism, Nestorianism, Eutychianism, nor Manichaeism, nameless and unwritten, distinguished only by its vulgarity, such as were well characterized by the popular saying, "For the pig's bride a bath of sewage" (cf 2 Peter 2:22). But why should it have been impossible to find a name for this heresy? And why was it unwritten? For the simple reason that it antedated all ecumenical councils which gave heresies their names, and was the error of unlettered primitive believers. That it also was something exceedingly vile and immoral, as Lazar insinuates and others after him frequently intimate, has yet to be proved.

That the Armenian love for puns played also its part in the use of these opprobrious terms, is quite possible. *Mdzghneutun*, Armenian for sodomy, would easily represent Messalianism. *Borboritae* would suggest *bor*, itself a Greek derivative and Armenian for leprosy, just as in the last century "Protestant" was twisted into *Borod*, a leper.

Nor would the punster have been at any loss to find material for his art in contemporary history. *Borboritae* and *Porphyritae* are not unlike in sound, especially in the Armenian. And Porphyry, third century philosopher, however popular among Armenian scholastics of later times, had much in common with the early Adoptionists. Porphyrite, in fact, was an early nickname for Arian. Porphyry denied the deity of Christ, and maintained that by faith, love and hope a man could lift himself up to the estate of deity. His rationalistic handling of the scriptures also would have seemed much like the private judgment which the Adoptionists advocated. By imperial edict, in 448, all copies of Porphyry's book against the Christians were consigned to the flames. This was the very time when feeling ran high against the *Borboritae* of Armenia.

As to Messalianism, that, too, readily would be identified with Massilianism, the heresy of Marseilles, originating in the East, but, in the modified form of the Pelagian error known as semi-Pelagianism, finding its proper home in the West. Pelagianism

was condemned along with Nestorianism at the Council of Ephesus in the year 431. These two great heresies, the one unduly abasing Christ, the other unduly exalting man, were each the reverse of the other, and alike were vehemently antagonized by the Monophysite Theopaschites, to which party, roughly speaking, the orthodox Armenians belonged. As making light of sin, and by implication of divine grace, Massilianism, like the Eastern Messalianism, would well have seemed to merit the imputation of "obscenity," and "sodomy."

But why were these early heretics of Armenia, instead of being confuted, so universally maligned? It cannot be that the learning necessary to combat them was lacking among the orthodox clergy. But where the people are to be the last court of appeal, it seems the part of prelatical discretion to seek aid in prejudice rather than in reason. And Adoptionism was a heresy that could not wisely have been combatted with arguments. The Armenian Adoptionists refused to recognize the hierarchy of the Church of the Empire which in the time of Gregory the Illuminator or soon thereafter invaded Armenia but to perpetuate in a new form the old pagan priesthood and mysteries. This attitude of the heretics constituted a grave menace to the hierarchy. Therefore the clergy had no desire by any open discussion to help cast doubts upon their own pretensions, and thereby possibly alienate some of their own new converts from paganism who demanded some sort of Christian priesthood to replace the old heathen. Hence the abuse of heretics, and the silence on their tenets.

Conybeare traces deposits of an older Adoptionism in the practices of the orthodox Church of Armenia.⁹

1. The observance of Christmas on the same day with the Epiphany, January 6, to the present time. This date is much older in the calendar of the Church at large than December 25, which was not fixed until toward the end of the fourth century. The conjunction of the Nativity with the Baptism is peculiarly Adoptionist, though the orthodox Armenian Church now uses it in its own way explaining the Incarnation as itself a self-revelation of Deity.

2. Traces of Adoptionist adult baptism may be found in the baptismal service of the orthodox Church, as for example when

the candidate, an infant, is spoken of as having previously been given a Christian name, and prayer is offered that he be enabled to live worthily of a future baptism. From which it appears very much as if the old Paulician name-giving service and the baptismal service have been rolled up into one. The delaying of baptism in the early Armenian Church is a practice rather common throughout the churches of early Christendom (fourth and fifth centuries), and is not in itself to be used as an argument for affinity with Paulicianism.

3. The aversion of multitudes of Armenians along the Taurus ranges so late as the twelfth century to church edifices and worship is a peculiarly heretical and Paulician, and therefore Adoptionist, notion.

External evidence is not lacking for the heretical character of early Armenian Christianity.

1. Eusebius of Cesarea in Palestine (died about 339 A.D.), in his *Ecclesiastical History*, testifies that Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, some time between the years 247 and 265 addressed a letter to Merujan, Bishop of Armenia, about "repentance," or "repentants." Now what can this mean if not that the Armenians of Merujan's diocese had in their midst heretics who were in need of a change of mind? Merujan in fact is a common name among the Ardžrunians of the region of Vaspuragan (the modern Van), and there we know from another source (the Acts of Archelaus) Adoptionism fifty years later was the prevailing orthodoxy.

2. There is also the Letter of Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem, to the Armenians, written somewhere between 325 and 335 A.D., which Conybeare gives in an English translation in the Appendix to his work on *The Key of Truth*. From this letter it appears: (a) That there was at that time in Armenia a special aversion to fonts, baptism being performed with any sort of vessel, deacons even administering the rite; (b) that the clergy were on a parity, and diocesan bishops were unpopular, while any priest at all could consecrate the chrism or holy ointment, and (c) that there were Arians in the land whose presence contaminated assemblies for the communion, observed more as a Jewish paschal rite, with the "mixed" cup, than as a Christian sacrament with the Sep-

tuagint "unmixed wine" of the Twenty-Third Psalm. These circumstances all point in the direction of the heresy of Adoptionism as held by the later Paulicians. The observance of paschal rites in connection with Easter and the designation of Easter as Passover have a more universal origin than Armenian alone.

3. Last of all we have the testimony of Basil the Great in the closing decades of the fourth century. From the correspondence of this Father it appears: (a) That the Armenian Bishop Phaulstus, refused by Basil himself, was granted consecration by Basil's Arian rival, Anthimus of Tyana, whereupon he was excommunicated by Basil; (b) that the Nicene orthodoxy was unpopular in Armenia, so much so that even those among the Armenian clergy who were of one mind with the great Cappadocian followed a politic and dubious course so soon as they set foot on their own soil; (c) that the orthodox bishops of the East, Nerses, the Catholicos of Armenia, being among the number, addressed a memorial to the bishops of Italy and Gaul, appealing for aid in combatting a heresy akin to Arianism which then swept over all lands from Illyria to the Thebaid, of whose peculiarities one was the demand for a popular election of bishops, still the prevailing Armenian practice; (d) that this heresy in essence was Arianism, as witness Basil's own words: "There is among them a great God and a little one; for 'the Son' is not a name connoting the nature (of Christ), but is esteemed a title conveying some sort of dignity. The 'Holy Spirit' is not to be complementary of the Holy Trinity, nor a sharer of the divine and blessed nature, but to belong to the realm of created things, tacked on, no matter how, to the Father and the Son."

The early Judaized Christianity of Armenia found entrance into that country from Antioch, where Unitarianism was always much in vogue. Not only was Paul of Samosata, the Unitarian leader, a Bishop of Antioch, but so was also his kindred spirit, Nestorius, native of Germanicia (Marash), before he became Bishop of Constantinople.

The above facts will serve to explain why Armenian orthodox writers of the fifth century so studiously ignore the earlier Christianity of their land, and make it appear as if Armenian Christianity began with Gregory the Illuminator. There was a past of

which they were ashamed and which by a conspiracy of silence they were determined to eradicate.

Gregory the Illuminator

The labors of Gregory the Illuminator mark the entrance of Armenian Christianity upon a new phase. Under him Christianity becomes the state religion, and that religion is the Trinitarian or Logos Christianity, destined to become the orthodoxy of the Church of the Roman Empire.

The divine overruling providence is clearly traced in antecedent events. A change of dynasties in Persia brings the Sassanians into power, and occasions plottings against the Armenian Arsacide dynasty related to the overthrown house of Persia. A Persian Arsacide, Anak, by treachery slays his kinsman, Khosrov, King of Armenia, and in turn is slain by the Armenian nobles. His son Gregory, together with the King's son, Tiridates, are left fatherless at a tender age (240 A.D.). Eventually Tiridates finds asylum in Rome, where he receives training under Licinius, while Gregory is reared and educated at Cesarea in Cappadocia.

Tiridates in 287, with the assistance of the Emperor Diocletian, regained his paternal throne. During festivities in celebration of the event at the Temple of Anahita at Eriza, the King detected Gregory, now returned, a Christian, "to pay his debt to the fatherland." Gregory was taken into custody, examined by the King, tortured with many refinements of cruelty, and owing up to his relationship to the assassin of the King's father, cast into the pit of the dungeon of the fortress of Artaxata, a place in Ararat province for the detention of condemned criminals. As by a miracle Gregory survived his hardships, for thirteen years being fed by a widow, and lived to see the conversion of the King and his proclamation of Christianity as the established religion of the land. In the year following this event (302 A.D.), by popular vote he was elected first Catholicos of Armenia, and received ordination at the hand of Leontius, Archbishop of Cesarea. Thus Armenia became the first country to make Christianity the established faith, anticipating Constantine's Edict of Toleration (313) by a dozen years, and that at a time when the Empire as yet was anything but friendly to the new religion. Pagan Rome in fact

in the person of Maximin Daza in 311 waged war on Christian Armenia.

Agathangelus, private secretary to King Tiridates, and chronicler of the times, whose book is the first martyrology of the Armenian Church, gives the details of the conversion of King and country. Gregory safely in prison, the King issued an edict calling upon all loyal subjects to report to his government all and sundry known to be guilty of disrespect to the gods, promising informants for reward the properties of their victims. Another edict to the same effect was issued thirteen years later calling history to witness that the past military successes of Armenia had been owing solely to the protection of the gods, while more recent reverses were due to insults paid to them by Christians and their sympathizers. Informants were promised royal bounties and honors, while against those harboring Christians was denounced the extreme penalty, with forfeiture of their homes to the crown.

It appears, however, that this persecution, pressed in dead earnest, preyed upon the King's own mind and induced a state of insanity known as lycanthropy in which he imagined himself transformed into a wild boar, his own name, Tiridates (Gift of the Wild Boar God), seemingly contributing to the fancy. Gregory was released from the pit, the King cured of his affliction, and for the space of sixty-six days the Saint held in the royal vineyards, just outside the capital city of Neapolis (Valarshabad), a camp meeting, having the King and nobles for his chief listeners. Whole families of the commonalty, men, women and children, from all the provinces of the land, flocked to the evangelist's preaching. Nothing behind the modern gospel preacher, Gregory gave, after the manner of the apostles, not alone general, but also individual instruction. "Speaking to each one according to his need, he taught them all." A familiar knowledge of the Scriptures, intense fervor of speech, a lively imagination, a gentle refinement of manner, and the reputation of one who long had been a sufferer for the Name and now was a favorite of the King, all seem to have conspired together to draw the multitudes.

At the end there were mass conversions. Old and young of both sexes, deeply affected and penitent, appealed to the Saint for help, while others solicited healing for body or mind. "Then forthwith

the King, by his absolute command, and with the ready consent of the people, gave the blessed Gregory authority to wipe out the very memory of the latterly supposed gods of his ancient paternal ancestors and of himself, now called no gods, and to destroy them from the midst." Armed with a newly roused public conscience and the royal mandate, the King's troops at his back, Gregory proceeded to destroy by turns the temples of Tyr at Erazamuyn, of Anahita at Artaxata, of Barsamina at Tortan, of Aramazd at Fort Ani, of Anahita at Eriza, of Nana at Til, and of Mithra at Pacarij, breaking down all armed resistance, and confiscating temple properties to the Church and to the poor fund. The King on this undertaking accompanied Gregory, everywhere seconding the Saint's efforts, and bearing his own testimony to the divine mercy. Then Tiridates returned to his capital, called a grand review of his armies and of all officialdom, and then and there proposed the election of Gregory to the dignity of Catholicos of All the Armenians, an honor which Gregory at first modestly declined and afterward humbly accepted. Escorted by sixteen Governors of provinces, the Saint was taken to Cesarea, to be ordained by Leontius and his Bishops as Catholicos of Armenia.

Gregory rode in the King's golden chariot drawn by white mules, the sixteen provincial governors accompanying him each in his own chariot or on horseback, an escort of troops conveying presents of gold and silver, horses and mules, multi-colored garments, and ornaments for the sanctuary. Feted in all the cities along the line of march, the cavalcade proceeded on its journey to the capital city of Cappadocia. Then, having duly received his ordination and consecration as Universal Bishop of Armenia, Gregory again returned by way of Sebastea (Sivas), where also he tarried some days to persuade a number of "brethren" to proceed with him to Armenia to assist in its evangelization, which had only yet begun. Everywhere along his way home the common people flocked to the Saint, to get a glimpse of him, or perchance to receive his blessing.

The triad of temples dedicated to Vahagn, Anahita and Aphrodite, at Ashtishat, in the province of Taron, where Kings of Armenia had been wont to offer sacrifices, Gregory upon his return utterly destroyed together with their priests, and in their

place erected his first Christian edifice, older than the Cathedral Church of Etchmiadzin, wherein he deposited relics of John the Baptist he had brought with him from Cesarea. The location of the sanctuary to-day is marked by the three churches, which the Turks call Utch Kilisseh, reminiscent of the three pagan deities and their temples. At Ashtishat Gregory first baptized the nobles that were with him, and afterward the populace, to the number of 190,000, and thence sent out preachers of the word in all directions. "Then through every district, and through every province, over towns and country places he went about building churches, performing baptisms and placing priests."

The King, with his Queen and Sister, proceeded in state from the capital to Bagavan, the city of altars, to meet Gregory coming with his retinue and a multitude of the people who at various points of his journey had attached themselves to him. The two companies met on the Euphrates at the foot of Mt. Nbad (Ala Dagh). Here a thirty days' fast and prayer was proclaimed, and over 150,000 of the soldiery, and altogether upward of four million men, women and children, if we may believe the Chronicler, were in a week's time baptized.

Churches were established throughout the land, in towns, villages, and in the open country, each country church being assigned by royal edict four sections of land for its maintenance, and each city church seven sections. The Cathedral Church of Etchmiadzin was erected upon a spot designated to Gregory by the Lord Himself, the "Only Begotten" who "descended" (so the name means) for the purpose, in a vision, at the time of the first preaching at Neapolis. According to the Chronicler Gregory beheld the Son of God, a heroic figure of light, with a golden hammer in his hand, in which one is permitted to discern the Cross turned into an instrument of wrath, and with the Lord an angelic host, as numerous as the dust that sparkles in the sunlight through a window. Four crosses of light completed the vision, three of them marking the sites for reliquaries to be erected to the memory of martyrs of the late persecutions, and one, greatest of them all, indicating the location of the National Cathedral.

Gregory made it one of his first concerns to secure the release of prisoners serving unjust sentences for debts, victims of late

persecutions. He also established orders of anchorites, he himself from time to time retiring from active life to mountain solitudes near the sources of the Euphrates, accompanied by a few of his hermits, dwelling with them in caves, subsisting on wild herbs, and devoting his time to study, meditation and prayer, from which periodically he returned to his people to preach. He is said to have ordained altogether more than 400 chorepiscopoi or local bishops, besides numerous presbyters, deacons and readers. Twelve sons of former pagan priests by him were consecrated bishops of as many dioceses.

Like all great missionaries and evangelists, Gregory conceived that a Christian education was the best and surest conserver of Christianity. He therefore early turned his attention to that most important interest. In all the provincial centers children were gathered into schools under faithful (the word is to be emphasized) school-masters. Allowances were assigned to children of pagan priests deprived of their living to make it possible for them to attend these schools. These were divided into two classes, in some the Greek, in others the Syriac language being the medium of study. Nor while the children were being educated was the adult population, including the rude peasantry, neglected. Instructed in the new faith at home, they made such good progress that they could truly say, "I forgot my people and my father's house." However, we are not to take those enthusiastic words of the Chronicler without a grain of salt. Phaustus, a historian of the fifth century, will correct the other when he says of the Armenians: "From the earliest times, when they took upon themselves the name of Christianity, it was merely as a human religion, a necessary human superstition, and not as was becoming from a warm piety, in knowledge, hope and faith, for those only understood it by little or much who were somewhat familiar with either Greek or Syrian letters."

Gregory's parish in time extended from Amida and Nisibis on the south, to the land of the Moscheti and the Caspian Gate (Derbent) on the north, and from the Roman border on the west to the Persian Atropatene on the east. "All the days of his life, in summer and in winter, by day and by night, undaunted and undelayed, preaching the gospel and the peace of Christ by his

own life, before both kings and princes and before all the people, irresistible to his opponents, he bore about with him the name of Jesus, the Savior of the World, and everywhere clothed men in the garments of God and of the Spirit." Truly a man of apostolic mould!

The King repeatedly importuned him to come to the Capital to live. But to him court life was distasteful, and he preferred the life for which by divine providence he had been intended. Eventually he was prevailed upon to ordain his own younger son, Aristaces, then a monk at Cesarea, to the active responsibilities of the Catholicate, and some few years afterward he died, among his beloved mountains. Some shepherds discovered his remains, which being removed to the royal capital were by pious hands deposited in the Cathedral Church which he himself had built. The piety of a later day fancied that his light still burned upon the top of Mt. Aracadz (Alageuz Dagh), visible like some Holy Grail, alone to the pure in heart.

Nerses the Great

Gregory's elder son, Vertanes, succeeded his younger brother in the Catholicate of Armenia in 339 A.D. It may have been a stroke of ecclesiastical diplomacy on his part intended to conciliate the older or Ebionite party in the Church, that he wrote to Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem, asking for instructions for the Church of Armenia, which as we have seen were given, and which we are told he transmitted to all the bishops of the land. In the first year of his reign the Moscheti petitioned him for a Bishop, and Vertanes consecrated his own young son Gregorius for the office. This marked the beginning of the Catholicate of the Iberians (Georgians) and Albanians, peoples among whom the gospel previously had been disseminated under Gregory's direction. In those days it was no sinecure to be Catholicos of the Albanians. Wearied of his denunciations of their sins, and suspecting in his pacific teaching designs of the Armenian monarch, the Albanians caused Gregorius to be dragged to his death at a wild horse's tail, and invaded Armenia.

Nerses, surnamed the Great, was fourth in the male line from Gregory the Illuminator. Difficult as it is to unravel the skein of

the history of his time, the attempt must here be made. Chamberlain to King Arsaces, Nerses, at the age of thirty-seven years was raised by popular acclamation to the Catholicate. Shorn of his locks that descended to the shoulders, divested of his sword and jewelled belt, he was ordained in the presence of King and nobles a Deacon, following which, escorted by twenty-six nobles, thirteen bishops, and 4,000 horsemen, he was conducted to Cesarea in Cappadocia to be ordained a priest and Catholicos by the then primate, Eusebius (364 A.D.). The event was followed by a political mission to Constantinople, Nerses taking with him the Armenian heir-apparent, Pap, for a hostage at the Byzantine court.

No sooner had Nerses returned home and ascended the patriarchal throne than he called together at Ashtishat, the "Mother Church of Armenia," a synod of bishops and nobles to take action on certain matters of pressing interest (365). At this synod the intermarriage of near relatives among the nobility, prompted by a desire to prevent alienation of patrimonial estates, was prohibited. Pagan wailings over the dead, self-disfigurements, and like practices were solemnly denounced. Hospitals for indigent sick, refuges for lepers, homes for the blind and halt, asylums for orphans and widows, and hostelryes for passing strangers in towns and cities were planned, the maintenance of them being provided from produce of the country and cash contributions of the cities. For such religious ascetics as until then had been in the habit of whiling away their time idly in towns and cities three sorts of abodes were designated, namely, single huts for anchorites living in isolation in mountains and deserts, monasteries for cenobites sheltered under one roof but in separate cells, and convents for monks dwelling together in communities. Under these provisions some 2,000 buildings large and small were constructed. For this was the age of the Nitrian monks, and of Simon Stylites, of Basil of Cesarea and of Eustathius of Sebastea, a period of church history in which monachism grew apace throughout the Roman Empire.

But it was not for long that Nerses remained on good terms with King Arsaces and the royal family. The King, during the life of his second wife and in defiance of the Church, took unto himself a third, widow of his own nephew whom he had slain.

In indignation Nerses retired from the Capital to a convent, while the Persian monarch, Sapor, following a thirty years' war, seized Arsaces, and blinding him immured him in the Tower of Oblivion at Susiana (367), where three years later the hapless King committed suicide.

At this time Sapor made the first serious attempt to convert Armenia to Mazdaeism. If we may trust the figures of the historian who is fond of numerical exaggerations, upwards of 100,000 Armenian households, together with some 95,000 Jewish families brought as captives of war by Tigranes the Great 400 years before, were deported to Persia. Bishops and priests were sent in bonds to Persia and Assyria, where many of them endured martyrdom. Following this the mokbeds went through Armenia with armed men, offering the alternatives of Mazdaeism or death. All Armenian books written in Greek characters at this time were delivered to the flames, and the study of Greek language and letters strictly prohibited.

In the end the Emperor Theodosius interfered. An army under Count Trajan and Vadomair the German was dispatched to help a distracted people. The allied Roman and Armenian forces met the Persians in battle in the valley of the modern Diadin (371). Like another Moses, Nerses, from the near-by heights of Mt. Nbad, with uplifted hands implored the Deity for the triumph of the Christian cause. His prayer was answered, and Arsaces' son, Pap, securing his father's throne, the return of peace afforded Nerses the opportunity to undertake the work of rehabilitation, distributing relief to the destitute, rebuilding churches and monasteries, and filling again the depleted ranks of the clergy.

When Pap, then a mere youth, assumed the reins of government at Neapolis, Nerses, in the presence of nobles, and the higher and lower clergy, exacted from him a sworn pledge to govern his people righteously, nor to walk in the ways of his dissolute father. The nobles on their part bound themselves in every way to support the King. These promises, however, soon were broken on both sides. It is alleged that Pap, having been reprimanded by the Catholicos, poisoned him (373), a story some modern critics discredit. Be that as it may, Pap's "dissoluteness" would seem to have been not less ecclesiastical than personal. It

is certain that he alienated the Primate of Cesarea, from whom the Catholici of Armenia had been wont to receive consecration. And not only so, but after the death of Nerses he put his hand forth to undo that prelate's Hellenizing work in church and state, discouraging monasticism, and pursuing a pronounced pro-Persian policy. He was treacherously assassinated at a banquet under orders from the Emperor Valens.

It was ever the tragedy of Armenia that it was not permitted to take sides for or against either one of its powerful neighbors, nor yet was allowed to remain neutral. In matters religious, as Christian it displeased Persia, as dissenter it displeased Rome. The only solution seemed dismemberment. In 385 Persia and the Empire arrived at a compromise whereby Armenia was divided between them. By the terms of this agreement the Empire gained possession of the strategic western portion of the country, while Persia acquired the lion's share, the greater eastern half, which, until the year 428 A.D., was permitted to be governed by tributary kings. This division of the country marked the final severance of the ties binding the Church of Armenia to the see of Cesarea and the Church of the Empire.

CHAPTER III

TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE

ISAAC, son of Nerses the Great, had pursued his studies at Constantinople. A widower, he took to the monastic life, and gathered around himself some sixty pupils. At the age of thirty-nine (387), by sanction of Khosrov III, of Armenia, he was consecrated Catholicos. This invited the wrath of Sapor III, who did not regard the house of Gregory, with their known Greek sympathies, with any kindly eyes. His successor, Bahram IV, on the mere pretext that Khosrov had made his appointment without authority of his suzerain, deposed him (392). Khosrov died in captivity, but his intercession at the Persian court secured his successor Vramshabouh (Bahram-Sapor) permission to reinstate Isaac on the patriarchal throne.

At this time flourished a monk of the name of Mesrop, whose career was destined to be intimately linked with that of Isaac. Mesrop was a native of Taron (Mush) province. Proficient from his youth in Hellenic, Syriac and Persian studies, he had disciplined himself to the Catholicos Nerses, whom also he had served as private secretary. Following the death of Nerses, Mesrop filled a court secretaryship, in which capacity doubtless he more than ever was impressed with the need of allaying Persian suspicions by a show of literary detachment from the West. But before everything else Mesrop was a cleric, and after seven years at court he journeyed eastward to the Canton of Goghtn, in Vaspuragan province, to teach the scriptures to the youths of a conventual school there.

A man of his gifts, however, could not long be left in virtual retirement. The early monks were before all else preachers of the Word, and Mesrop in 396 received orders from the Catholicos to go on a preaching tour to combat paganism and heresy. Obeying the patriarchal behest he travelled between towns and cities proclaiming repentance unto salvation, and expounding the scriptures from the Greek and Syriac texts. It was in the course of this work that, finding but little help from an unlearned clergy, he conceived the idea of putting the Bible into the people's own

tongue. It is to be recalled that this was a time of special activity in the popularizing of the scriptures in the Church at large. Jerome's Latin Vulgate appeared in 405, and Rabbula undertook his Peshitto version of the Syriac in 411. Mesrop, however, was handicapped by a lack of a native Armenian alphabet, foreign alphabets at this time being in use in Armenia, Persian and Greek in court correspondence, Greek and Syriac in ecclesiastical writings, all three alphabets alike inadequate to convey the Armenian.

Invention of the Alphabet

Mesrop conceived that an Armenian alphabet must be devised. And in doing this all the various sounds of the language must be isolated so that a different symbol could be designed for each sound to be represented, thus obviating any uncertainties of pronunciation. He came to Neapolis and confided his thoughts to Isaac, who manifested a keen interest in the project. The two men formed a fraternity of prayer to seek divine guidance in their task.

At this juncture (400 A.D.) King Vramshabouh, on a military mission in Mesopotamia, was approached by a Syrian monk, Abel by name, who divulged that one Daniel, a relative of his own, had in his possession an Armenian alphabet already devised. The King, however, at the time seems to have given the matter no particular thought. Perhaps he was too much engrossed in his own state affairs. Perhaps he did not fancy the idea of encouraging more Syrian monks on one pretext or another to invade Armenia.

Mesrop, however, presently returned to the Catholicos, and prevailed on him to call a synod for the special object of discussing the matter. A synod of bishops and doctors of the Church was called accordingly (402). The King being also present then told the synod what he had learned from Abel the Syrian, whereupon the assembled ecclesiastics besought him to send someone into Mesopotamia to press the matter further. The King designated one of his own household, Vahrij by name, to go on the proposed mission, bearing from King and synod letters of introduction to Daniel. Vahrij, having journeyed to Mesopotamia, familiarized himself with Daniel's alphabet, and accompanied by

Abel returned to Armenia to lay the result of his inquiries before Isaac and Mesrop. This alphabet, which followed the Greek, was then put to the practical test through the instruction of a select group of youths. So far does it at first sight seem to have appeared satisfactory that the King ordered the use of it throughout the schools of the country, Mesrop, now ordained to the Doctorate, being placed in charge of the enterprise.

A two years' experimentation, however, developed in the alphabet some serious defects. Neither the names of the characters, nor the sounds assigned to them, were always accurate, nor yet were there a sufficient number of them. King and Catholicos therefore decided to send Mesrop himself to Daniel for more light. Going down accordingly with a few of his pupils to Mesopotamia, Mesrop, however, discovered that Daniel was incompetent to render further aid. He did learn, as in his disappointment he was preparing to leave for home, of a certain pagan rhetorician, Director of the Library of Edessa, Pilatus by name, from whom it was suggested he might hope for assistance. Alas that Pilatus, too, unfamiliar that he was with the Armenian, even after carefully scrutinizing the peculiarities of the language, confessed himself impotent to help, except that he was able to refer Mesrop to his own one-time teacher, Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, in Cyprus, famed theologian and expert linguist. Mesrop, armed with a letter from Pilatus, and another from Babylas, Bishop of Edessa, proceeded to the Phoenician coast. But before he had gone far he learned that Epiphanius had died at sea on his way home from Constantinople, and the journey to Cyprus was abandoned. Next we find Mesrop in Samosata, with Rufinus, another pupil of Epiphanius, who seems none other than Rufinus the Syrian, personal friend of Theodore of Mopsuestia. At last Mesrop's quest was to be rewarded.

Our sources do not tell a clear or consistent story of what Mesrop actually did in completing with Rufinus the Armenian alphabet. But happily we do not entirely depend on the chroniclers. It is possible for us to arrive at the process by scrutinizing the product. A close examination of the Armenian alphabet will serve to convince one that at the base of it is the Phoenician, mother of alphabets, some of the so-called Mesropic characters

(the capitals now in use) plainly following the Cyprian form of the Phoenician. This clearly accounts for twenty different characters, including the five vowels. With the single transposition of the equivalents of the Greek *kappa* and *lambda*, these twenty may safely be taken for the original Danielic characters arranged in the order of the Greek. These left Mesrop sixteen letters short of representing all the diverse sounds of the Armenian. And here apparently is just where Mesrop, with the help of Rufinus, accomplished his more distinctively original task. He isolated the compound sounds, referred to by his biographer, Gorun, as "double" (*grgnavor*), and which with the one single exception of *tzade* neither the Phoenician nor the Greek possessed. Rufinus who, as we are told, was an expert calligraphist, appears to have designed the characters to represent these sounds, viz.: *dj*, *dt*, *dz*, *gh*, *j* (soft *h*), *kh*, *ph*, *rr*, *sh*, *sj*, *tch*, *tsch*, *ts* and *tz*, as well perhaps as the two variations of the second vowel. Ordinary ingenuity will bring out the makeup of these characters found so needlessly difficult to unriddle. To take the most obvious instances, the character **ⲁ** on the face of it is but a reduplicated **Ⲁ**, thus **ⲁⲀ**, while the variations of the second vowel, **Ⲃ** (equivalent of the French *é*), are obviously formed, the first, **Ⲃ**, French *è*, simply by turning down the lower arm of the original, and the second, **Ⲃ**, *ê* as in the French *le* (the), by also pushing to the top the upper. In Gorun, our original source, there is no word of a divine revelation. Soon such an embellishment seems to have been invented to rebuff the common Byzantine claim that Greek was the sole authentic ecclesiastical language. With the same object also doubtless the Armenian alphabet, beginning as it does with the initial, **Ա**, of the name for God (*Asdvadz*), was made to end with the equivalent of the Phoenician *koph*, turned forward to be written from left to right, and by the isolation and emphasizing of the cross-bar rendered cruciform, **ⲫ**, and the more appropriately that the Armenian *che*, like the Greek *chi*, is the initial of the word for Christ, thus setting to the national alphabet the Christian seal.

As the year (404) was now advanced, and winter travel in Armenia was difficult, Mesrop concluded to remain in Mesopotamia a while longer, and commenced his work of translation

by rendering into the Armenian the Book of Proverbs, which Rufinus set down in the new characters as Mesrop dictated. This circumstance affords us assurance that that portion of scripture in the Armenian Bible is from Mesrop's own very hand.

The Times of the Translators

At the opening of the season Mesrop and his pupils returned home, and were accorded a right royal welcome. King, Catholicos and clergy came out to meet them on the Rah River (Arpachai), and conducted them in state to the Capital. By permission of the heads of Church and State, Mesrop now opened schools in all the provinces of Persian Armenia, in which select youths could be taught the arts of reading and writing. All books in the Armenian language written in Greek or in Syriac characters now were laboriously transcribed. Mesrop sought to do the same sort of work for his people in Roman Armenia, but the Empire at first was not friendly to his project. He met with better success in the north, where he gave the Georgians and the Albanians each a national alphabet, the first in 410, the second in 423. The Catholicos meantime was engaged in the translation of that portion of the Old Testament for which he had assumed the responsibility, namely, the historical books, Mesrop himself being in charge of the second half of the Old Testament and the whole of the New. As the Persians had burned all copies of the Greek Septuagint in the land, the translation of the Old Testament at the first followed Syriac manuscripts.

On the death of Vramshabouh, Khosrov was restored to the throne of Armenia (413), but reigned less than a year. His restoration might have seemed to bode an improvement in Persian policy, but if it did that improvement did not long endure. In 418 Jezdegerd I inaugurated another large-scale persecution of Christians. They were tortured to death; their churches were demolished. When in 420 Jezdegerd died, the Armenian nobles revolted, and thereafter for three years the country was distracted by war. In the midst of these conditions Isaac left Pers-Armenia for the Roman territories, being accompanied by Mesrop and his own three grandchildren, the eldest of whom, Vartan Mamigonian, was to play a distinguished part in subsequent history.

The fugitives at the first were not cordially received in Roman Armenia, neither were they permitted to open schools or teach Armenian letters.

A complaint, however, to the Emperor and Patriarch, secured more satisfactory treatment. Isaac wrote personally to Theodosius II and the Patriarch Atticus, reputed to have been an Armenian of Sebastea, sending his missives by the hand of Mesrop and Vartan. An Imperial edict promptly accorded to Isaac the recognition to which he felt he was entitled and the right to open schools. Vartan incidentally was honored with the rank of *Stratelates*, and Mesrop accorded the title of *Ecclesiasticus*. The latter requested of the Patriarch a correct copy of the Greek scriptures from which to revise the Armenian translation. Atticus promised to hunt and forward such a manuscript to Armenia, and in his turn transmitted a request to Isaac either to convert or to evict the Arians of Roman Armenia known to later history by the name of Paulicians and Tonrakians. The Emperor on his part was led to instruct his general, Anatolius, to rebuild Theodosiopolis (Garin) for an outpost against Persia.

But Isaac sought in Roman Armenia no permanent home. And before long the opportunity offered for him to return east. Vram (Bahram) after three years of war seems to have sensed the folly of needlessly devastating, depopulating and impoverishing one of his richest provinces, and a more conciliatory policy followed. The Armenian nobles were encouraged to reinstate the exiled Catholicos who, leaving Mesrop and Vartan behind in Roman Armenia, with his remaining two grandsons returned east.

Mesrop meantime took steps to convince the heretics of Theodosiopolis of the error of their way, and failing in this to scatter them. Not indeed all of them, nor perhaps a great many of them. For we hear much of these heretics in later centuries in that very same region. His work concluded in the west, Mesrop then turned east to Goghtn Canton, where once more the same or a similar error was reported to have lifted its head, and again was called north by rumors of heresy there. It should be clear by now that Isaac and Mesrop were busy men. What with the pursuit of heretics, the demands made by the political situation, the routine

of church administration, the instruction of youth, and the translation of the Bible, they did not live a life of idleness. It is small wonder that the work of Bible translation occupied many years.

However, the work at last was done. It was now twenty-two years since Mesrop first put his hand to the translation of the Book of Proverbs, and seventeen years since Isaac commenced his work on the Books of Moses. But they still felt that the work needed correcting and retouching in many places. They therefore dispatched six of their best pupils to Constantinople (426), to master the Greek language, consult the best manuscript authorities on the Bible and other books, and return home to assist in completing the work of revision. The young men were about seven years at the Imperial City. This interim Isaac and Mesrop improved compiling church books from the Greek and the Syriac, as well as from native Armenian originals. Thus the *Jamakirk* or Hoursbook, the *Donazuyz* or Calendar-Book, the *Badaracamaduyz* or Missal, the *Sharagnotz* or Hymnary, and the *Mashtotz* or Ritual came into being in their primitive forms.¹⁰

In the year 422 Ardashir came to the throne of Armenia. He proved himself but another "profligate" king. The nobles refused to support him, and entreated Isaac to join with them in a complaint to Vram. They designed to ask in the stead of Ardashir a Persian Governor who they seem to have judged would be a more responsible official. But in such a change Isaac could only discern a serious menace to the Church. He urged the nobles to be patient, arguing that a "scabby lamb" were better than a "husky wolf." The nobles, however, were not amenable to reason. Taking with them a subservient priest to Vram's court, they pressed their complaint, now involving Isaac himself. The upshot was that both Ardashir and Isaac were summoned by the Persian, and both of them disgraced, the King being banished, the Catholicos jailed, and their properties forfeited to the Persian Crown. The pagan appointed Surmac, the aforementioned priest, to succeed Isaac at the head of the Church, and Mihr-Shabouh, the Persian, was named Governor of Armenia, thus putting a period to the rule of the Arsacides in the land (428).

Isaac after a while was permitted to return to his native country, but on the condition that he would engage in no pro-Roman ac-

tivities (432). The Catholicos is said to have replied to the King's insinuation and to his depreciation of the Christian faith accompanying, in language so gracious and withal so uncompromising as to have held King and courtiers spellbound. The King in token of his goodwill appointed Vartan, grandson of the Catholicos, chief of the clan of the Mamigonians, Generalissimo of the native militia of Armenia.

In the year just preceding, the Council of Ephesus, condemning Nestorianism, had convened in the west (431). Isaac then was in Persia, and therefore, though invited, unable to attend. Leontius, John, Joseph, Artzan, Eznik and Gorun, all pupils of Mesrop, however, are said to have been at Constantinople at the time. Learning of the return of Isaac from Persia, these young men made haste to go home, bringing with them the decisions of Ephesus, together with two volumes of the Scriptures, an excellent copy of the Greek Testament, and a specially valuable copy of the Septuagint Old Testament, both of which the Patriarch Maximian had secured for them.

Arrived in Armenia, they found Isaac and Mesrop, with several bishops of the Church, met together in a synod at the city of Ashtishat, to attend to some matters of discipline which during Isaac's absence had demanded increasing attention. There the decisions of the Ecumenical Council were delivered, and a general synod called to meet again at the same place for the purpose of taking official action upon the decisions of Ephesus. Thus during the incumbency of an irregular Catholicos at Neapolis, appointed by the Persian monarch, Isaac, still the real head of the Armenian Church, with Mesrop at his right hand, took steps to conserve the orthodoxy of Armenia (432). A second synod at the same place (435) condemned the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, teacher of Nestorius, lately rendered into Armenian.

At the close of the synod of 432 Mesrop and others present besought Isaac to authorize the revision of the late translation of the Scriptures from the new manuscripts now in hand. This with the sanction of the Catholicos was done, under oversight of Mesrop and Eznik, thus giving the Armenian Version substantially its final form (433). Minor corrections were made at intervals in ensuing years. For this purpose younger pupils were sent to pur-

sue the study of Greek in Alexandria and Athens (434-440). It deserves record that the Fifteen Hundredth Anniversary of the Armenian Bible was celebrated by decree of the Catholicos Khoren in the ecclesiastical year of 1934-35.

Isaac and Mesrop did not long survive the consummation of their great task. Upon the death of the Catholicos, Samuel the Syrian, in 436, the Armenian nobles begged Isaac to return to his see, promising him the confirmation of the succession in his family forever. "To be again a High Priest over a disloyal people," he replied, "I cannot consent; depart from me, and leave me alone to mourn the ruin of my country." The nobles and the prelate parted in tears. No further move was made to select a Catholicos during Isaac's lifetime. But the end was not long delayed. The Persian Vram died in 439, and was succeeded by his son, Jezdegerd II, the great persecutor of the Christians. In the same year Isaac passed away, and was buried at Ashtishat. Six months later Mesrop followed him in death, and was interred in the village of Oshagan, near Neapolis, where a church erected in the nineteenth century marks his last resting-place.

CHAPTER IV

THE ARMENIAN BIBLE: A CRITIQUE

THE Armenian Bible, source and head of all Armenian ecclesiastical literature, has been called "the queen of all the versions." Does it deserve this reputation? That question we cannot better answer than by comparing the work of the Armenian translators with the English Revision. The text here used is that published by Zohrab, at Venice, in 1805, based on a quarto manuscript dated 1319 A.D., and supposedly made in Cilician Armenia.

The textual characteristics of the Armenian Old Testament are those of the Greek Septuagint. A specially choice copy of this Version is said to have been used in making the translation. A few texts will reveal the illuminating character of the work.

The Old Testament

Esau was a wild man, expert in the chase, "while Jacob was a plain home man" (Gen 25:27). The English of Numbers 11:32 does not make clear to the ordinary reader just what was actually done when the Israelites spread the quail "all abroad for themselves round about the camp." The Armenian says simply that the birds were sun-cured. According to the Armenian, Naaman "baptized" himself in the Jordan seven times (2 Kin 5:14), implying that the act was no plain dipping, but a religious lustration. The ornamental pillars in front of Solomon's Temple, Jachin and Boaz (2 Chr 3:17), are named right and might, a good motto for any ruler like Solomon.

The Prophets

An occasional rendering of the prophets is clearer in the Armenian, and more pointed.

ENGLISH REVISION

The prophets prophesy falsely,
and the priests bear rule by their
means (marg., at their hands);

ARMENIAN

The prophets prophesy falsehood,
and the priests applaud them
(clap their hands at them), and

and my people love to have it so: and what will ye do in the end thereof? Jer 5:31.

The iniquity of Ephraim is bound up; his sin is laid up in store. Hos 13:12.

Wherefore would ye have the day of the Lord? Amos 5:18.

What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God? Mic 6:8.

my people do enjoy it; and what will ye do after a while?

Ephraim is a bundle of iniquities, and his sins lie hidden.

What is there in common between you and the Day of the Lord?

What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justice, and to love mercy, and to be willing to follow the Lord thy God?

The Psalms

There are some significant touches in the Psalter. Note the following.

ENGLISH REVISION

In them (the heavens) hath he set a tabernacle for the sun. Psa 19:4.

My cup runneth over. Psa 23:5.

Evil shall slay the wicked; and they that hate the righteous shall be condemned. Psa 34:21.

They have set their mouth in the heavens, and their tongue walketh through the earth. Psa 73:9. I remember God, and am disquieted: I complain, and my spirit is overwhelmed. Psa 77:3.

I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God. Psa 84:10.

ARMENIAN

In the sun hath he set up his own tabernacle.

Thy cup hath made me drunk as with unmixed wine.

The death of the wicked is an evil; but whoso hateth the righteous shall rue it.

They have set their mouth in the heavens, and sweep the earth with their tongue.

I remembered God and rejoiced; I took anxious thought, and my spirit fainted within me.

I had rather be the sweepings of the House of God.

The Proverbs

For epigrammatic, pregnant, racy expression, the Book of Proverbs in its Armenian dress, Mesrop's own work, is probably unsurpassed in any language.

ENGLISH REVISION

Honor the Lord with thy substance. 3:9.

He goeth after her (the whoring woman) straightway, as an ox goeth to the slaughter, or as fetters to the correction of the fool (marg. says the text is probably corrupt); till an arrow strike through his liver. 7:22f.

When a wicked man dieth, his expectation shall perish; and the hope of iniquity perisheth. 11:7. All the days of the afflicted are evil: but he that is of a cheerful heart hath a continual feast. 15:15.

A divine sentence is in the lips of the king: his mouth shall not transgress in judgment. 16:10.

A friend loveth at all times, and a brother is born for adversity. 17:17.

He also that is slack in his work is brother to him that is a destroyer. 18:9.

Whoso findeth a wife findeth a good thing, and obtaineth favor of the Lord. 18:22.

Most men will proclaim every one his own kindness; but a faithful man who can find? 20:6.

Foolishness is bound up in the

ARMENIAN

Honor the Lord out of thine honest earnings.

He went after her like a fool, as an ox going to the slaughter, a dog on the leash and as a hart pierced by an arrow in the flank (the region of the liver, seat of the affections).

When a righteous man dies, hope perisheth not; but the boastings of the wicked shall perish.

At all times the eyes of the evil expect evil; but the good are calm at all hours.

Let there be prophecy in the lips of the king, and behold in judgment his mouth shall not go astray.

Friends thou wilt have at all times; but brothers wilt thou need in time of sorrow, for born they are just for that.

He who cares not for himself while at his work is brother to him who commits suicide.

Whoso findeth a good wife findeth favor, and obtaineth happiness, from the Lord.

Great is man, and worthy the kind-hearted man, but to find the faithful man, there's the rub!

Folly once inflamed in the heart

<p>heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him. 22:15.</p> <p>Weary not thyself to be rich; cease from thine own wisdom. 23:4.</p> <p>As in water face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man. 27:19.</p> <p>The poor man and the oppressor meet together: the Lord lighteneth the eyes of them both. 29:13.</p> <p>She perceiveth that her merchandise is profitable. 31:18.</p>	<p>of a youth, the rod and counsel touch him not.</p> <p>If thou art poor, enter not into rivalry with the rich man, but keep thou wisely away from him.</p> <p>As two faces are not alike, so neither are two hearts of men alike.</p> <p>When lender and borrower meet, the Lord understands them both.</p> <p>She hath tasted that it is sweet to toil.</p>
--	--

The Pentateuch

There are certain renderings of the Pentateuch that are a distinct correction and sometimes an improvement upon the English Revision. According to the Armenian of Genesis 37:2, it was Joseph's brethren that brought an evil report of him to their father, and not vice versa, which rather relieves Joseph's character of its one reputed blemish. At Genesis 42:9,12 Joseph says to his brethren according to the English, "Ye are spies; to see the nakedness of the land ye are come." In the Armenian he says, "to see the ins and outs of the land ye are come." The Commandment, in the Armenian, condemns light and frivolous swearing: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God over vain things," or trifles (Ex 20:7. Deut 5:11). Speaking of the false prophet, the English Revision says, "thou shalt not be afraid of him" (Deut 18:22); the Armenian, "thou shalt not forgive him," that is, he must be put to death. It is well known that in the times of the Septuagint Translators (third century Before Christ and later), the Jews accepted certain teachings that afterward in view of the support afforded to Christian apologetics they discarded. Chief among these is the idea of the vicarious atonement. Following the Septuagint, the Armenian Version makes plain the substitutionary character of sacrifice at Leviticus 17:11, "For the life of any flesh is the blood thereof; and I have given it to you upon the altar to

make atonement for your persons; that the blood of that flesh may be an atonement in the stead of this person."

New Testament Allusions

One advantage in the use of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament is that the common reader can readily see the allusion where a New Testament writer uses it instead of the original Hebrew. When for example the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says that Jacob worshipped on the top of his staff (Heb 11:21. Gen 47:31); or Stephen speaks of Moloch and Rephan (Ac 7:43. Amos 5:26f); or Peter declares, "If the righteous is scarcely saved, where shall the ungodly and sinner appear?" (1 Pet 4:18. Prov 11:31), or Paul admonishes, "Be ye angry, and sin not" (Eph 4:26. Psalms 4:4, marg.), the reader familiar with the Septuagint quickly sees the allusion. So, too, when at 2 Thessalonians 3:10 we read, "If any will not work, neither let him eat," a familiarity with that Version quickly detects Paul's reference to Proverbs 19:24, "He who lazily hides his hands in his bosom neither shall carry them up to his mouth."

The New Testament

The kinship of the Armenian and the Greek tongues in construction and idiom makes the Armenian New Testament especially a faithful rendering of the original. Thus in this version exact equivalents, often in the exact order of words, are used, sometimes without commitment to any definite interpretation. "Never hereafter from thee may fruit come forth forever" (Matt 21:19). So reads the original Greek, and so reads the Armenian. "Go give Caesar's to Caesar, and God's to God," is both the Greek and the Armenian of Matthew 22:21, where the English certainly sacrifices the terse incisiveness of the original to literary sententiousness. Did Jesus in John 3:3,7 tell Nicodemus he must be born over again, or from above, which? The answer is both. Nicodemus quite well apprehended that to be born from above was to be born all over again. There was no misunderstanding there. He only wondered how the thing itself was possible, how, that is, a man already made could be made over, how human nature could be changed (cf 1 Pet 1:3,23). The "double entendre" is

reflected in the Armenian, in which language also the word employed may mean either "from above," or "over again," except that "from above" takes the ablative preposition with it. In the English of Acts 2:47 we have: "The Lord added to them day by day those that were being saved." The Armenian reads: "The Lord added to the saved day by day to the selfsame end," namely, that they might show forth the Christian graces spoken of at vv. 44-46.

Impression More than Expression

But a translation must not by a slavish literalness do violence to the original intent. The impression to be made is more than the expression. Philip is said to have been told to join himself to a chariot (Ac 8:29). The Armenian renders it, "Go near and ascend that chariot." In the Armenian of Acts 17:4 the Greeks are not necessarily by race Greeks, but heathen. In the English of Ephesians 5:26f one reads, "Having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that he might present the Church to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle." But who ever heard of washing off a wrinkle? The Armenian says, "Not having spot or defilement." The rendering, quite permissible, is here necessary. How many youthful readers of the English Bible have wondered about the character of the Tree of Life which grows on either bank of a river? The Armenian makes it clear that "tree" here (Rev 22:2) is generic, meaning many trees.

The Armenian translators seem never to have forgotten that the Armenian Bible must be a book for Armenians. In the English the Prodigal's father says to his elder son, "Son, thou art ever with me" (Lk 15:31). In the Armenian for "son," he employs the diminutive of affection, just as an Armenian father would have done. At Matthew 25:25, where the English has the more literal rendering ("thou hast thine own"), the Armenian renders the words of the one-talent servant, "Behold thine to thee," a blunt expression more in keeping with the Armenian idiom, and quite also in keeping with the character and attitude of that shiftless and tactless man. The English of 1 Peter 2:17 reads, "Fear God. Honor the king." Quite right in the United Kingdom of the time of King James! But what of Armenia in the time of our

translators, torn that it was between two rival empires? The Armenian must needs read, "Honor kings"! In Hebrews 12:12, Jesus is called "the Commander-in-chief and the perfecter of the faith." That one verse alone must have armed a nation against the Persian bigot and nerved it to resist unto blood (v. 4). The Armenian Version had no marginal notes; what should have been done at Revelation 9:11? The English reads, "His name in Hebrew is Abaddon, and in the Greek tongue he hath the name Apollyon," with the marginal note appended, "That is, destroyer." The Armenian translation runs, "His name in Hebrew is Abaddon, which in the Armenian tongue is called Perdition."

The Translator as Interpreter

There are times when a translator is placed under the necessity of acting as interpreter, sometimes choosing between variant readings, always seeking to bring out of his original the most likely and best possible sense, and occasionally being forced by the demands of his own language to greater explicitness. He cannot satisfy these conditions unless he be thoroughly familiar with the genius of the original language. What competency do the Armenian translators show here? "Indeed risen is the Lord" (Lk 24:34) exclaim the Emmaus disciples glancing back to the seemingly incredible report of vv. 22-24, with which certain women had amazed them. The Armenian here follows manuscripts prefixing "ontos." What is meant at John 1:16 by "grace for grace"? The Armenian translators understand it as meaning that out of the fulness of Jesus Christ we all have received New Testament grace in exchange for Old. At John 19:30 Jesus says, "It is finished." The Greek is in just one word. The reader asks himself, What is finished? The Armenian says, "Everything is finished," or "perfected." At John 21:15 Jesus asks, "Lovest thou me more than these?" What, we ask, is meant by "these," things or people? The Greek is blind, and the English is content to leave it so. But the Armenian leaves no room for questionings. What Jesus asks is, "Lovest thou me more than do those persons yonder?" Yonder in the boat, too busy to join the nearer group about the speaker. At Luke 12:29, shall we read with the English translators, "Seek not what ye shall eat, and what ye shall drink, neither be ye of

doubtful mind"? It is permissible to read these last words with the Armenian, "neither be ye harassed (or, distracted) by these things." For if worry about temporalities is the sin of the poor, neither are the rich immune to the distractions of them. The English of James 1:11 says, "So also shall the rich man fade away in his goings." The Armenian reads: "So also shall the rich man fade away together with his gain." At Colossians 3:19 the English translation makes Paul say, "Husbands love your wives, and be not bitter against them." The Armenian has the transitive, "do not embitter them." The writer of Hebrews (12:8), according to the English, declares, "If ye are without chastening, then are ye bastards." The Armenian rendering may mean "step-children." Step-fathers are chary of correcting their step-children lest they be misunderstood.

A Few Fine Touches

Perfection is said to be a matter of detail. It is the little fine touches that make for perfection. Not that our translators are given to hyper-exegesis; we already have seen that they are not literalists. If for this further proof be needed, one may glance at Acts 3:4, where Peter "looks" upon the lame man, and says to him, "Look on us," two different words in the Greek, or consider the variations in the original for "love," and "shepherd," at John 21:15-17, in both of which cases our translators assume that no refinements of distinction are intended. But here, on the other hand, are a few instances of a different sort. "Those," we read (Matt 19:6. Mark 10:9), "whom God hath paired (Gr., "yoked together;" Eng., "joined together"), let not man put asunder." The Armenian of Matthew 20:15 may be rendered into English, "Art thou jealous because I am generous?" Cf Moffatt's Translation, ad loc. According to the Armenian of John 12:7, Jesus says of Mary, "she marked me for the burial," attributing to her a prophetic spirit. From the Armenian rendering of Luke 7:18 it appears that it was his being told in particular of the raising of the widow's son ("of all this," not "of all these things") that awakened the Baptist's expectations and kindled in him a desire to know more about Jesus' ministry. In the Armenian of Luke 8:4 the multitudes follow Jesus in delegations city by city, as

multitudes still do in pursuing the modern popular evangelist. According to the Armenian of Luke 17:20f., Christ said, "the kingdom of God cometh not by observances" (Eng., "with observation"). The English of Luke 20:6 has it that the people were "persuaded" that John was a prophet; the Armenian will not say so, but that the people "had it fixed in their minds," or as we should say in colloquial English, "had got it in their heads," "that John was a prophet."

A few more of these noteworthy renderings. Jesus says: "One's life does not derive from his hoard of goods" (Lk 12:15). In speaking of giving, Paul commends (2 Cor 9:7) a hyphenated grace: "God loveth gladly-generous gifts." As to what is done in secret among the sons of darkness, the same apostle says, "it is (not "a shame," but) filthy even to talk about it" (Eph 5:12). It appears that the women's meeting by the river-side (Ac 16:13) was one called by Paul and not one in which he had but a casual visitor's part: "By a river-side where they expected Paul would offer prayer" (compare the lame English, "Where we supposed there was a place of prayer;" the manuscripts vary). And what is baptism? It is an act of confession, an "exhibition." Symbolically it is the exhibition of a washed body, in reality the exhibition of a cleansed conscience before God (1 Pet 3:21). Elsewhere (Eph 5:26) the laver is the symbol of the cleansing, but the agent or medium of it is the word. "That he might cleanse her (the church) with the cleansing of the laver, with the word." The English is confused through the insertion of *catharisas*. At 1 Corinthians 2:13 the English Revision reads, "Comparing spiritual things with spiritual." Margin: "Interpreting spiritual things to spiritual men." The marginal reading comes closer to the Armenian, "Fitting spiritual things to spiritual (folk)." This rendering better falls into the drift of the passage. The apostle made no attempt to commend a spiritual gospel to unspiritual men. In Mark 4:24f the sequence of the thought as given in the English is not clear: "With what measure ye mete it shall be measured unto you;" "for he that hath, to him shall be given." The Armenian Version is more lucid: "Take heed what ye hear, and it shall be added to you who hear; by what measure ye mete it shall be meted out to you." That is, the measure of attention and apprehension that is brought to the

truth is the exact measure of one's appropriation of it. At John 14:2f., the Armenian makes our Lord say: "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you that I go to prepare a place for you; and even if I do go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will take you unto myself."

Galatians

A few outstanding verses of the Epistle to the Galatians may fittingly conclude this brief survey. "And I went up according to revelation, and impressed upon them the gospel which I preached among the gentiles, privately (that is), upon them who (not "were of repute," but) had thought that I had run or might be running in vain" (2:2). In other words, the visit to Jerusalem here spoken of was made in self-vindication. "But when Cephas came to Antioch, I turned against him, for he acted, it so seemed, like a guilty person" (2:11). Peter, that is, acted as if he were ashamed of his Christian freedom, and hid his light under a bushel.

"Be ye like unto me, for I, too, was once like unto you" (4:12). The American Revision reads, "Become as I am, for I also am become as ye are." The English Revision: "Be as I am, for I am as ye are." Neither of these renderings would seem to bring out the apostle's thought. Paul in effect, according to the Armenian, says, "I myself once was like you, a believer in the law, and I well know what it is to have graduated into grace." "My little children, of whom again I am in travail until Christ be imaged (Eng., 'formed') in you" (4:19). "Ye are shut off from Christ ('it is all off as between you and Christ'), ye who are justified by the law, and are fallen from grace" (5:4). To those who would be justified by the works of the law, Paul in those words denies all right of claim alike to Christianity and to salvation. "For we look for the Spirit's hope of righteousness by faith" (5:5). That the observance of the law is by no means the difficult part is also hinted at (6:12): "For those who once for all would be 'good fellows' through the flesh, do urge you to be circumcized, if only they do not have to follow (not, 'be persecuted for') the cross of Christ." Not persecution for the cross is so much in question as is the way of the cross itself.

Concluding Remarks

The texts used by the respective translators of the New Testament, into English and into Armenian, are so nearly identical that one receives no shock in passing from the one version to the other. During the first half of the fifth century of our era, when the Mesropian Version was made, the Armenian scholars who laid Alexandria, Athens and Constantinople under tribute for the best manuscripts available, practically had in their hands the same New Testament text as our own.

Throughout the New Testament, whether we consider the dignified periods of the exordium of John, or the sustained argument of Paul in Romans, the English and the Armenian are uniformly word for word parallel, so faithful are they both to the original. As to the Synoptics in particular, the sequence and continuity of thought are often more apparent in the Armenian than in the English, the Armenian Synoptics reading more like a continuous treatise than a collection of disconnected anecdotes.

On the whole the differences of the Armenian New Testament from the English are refinements of rendering rarely inferior, quite often superior, to those of the English Revision. And on the whole the Armenians of the fifth century had a better translation of the Bible than the English-speaking world in the twentieth, this statement applying within limits to the Old Testament as rendered from the Septuagint as well, the superiority of the Armenian Version involving accuracy, sense-value, point, polish and literary effect.

CHAPTER V

THE STRUGGLE WITH PERSIA

LIKE Sapor in the fourth century, Jezdegerd II (438-57) in the fifth cherished designs of making Mazdaeism the uniform faith of his empire with the expectation of so promoting national solidarity. We now are in the first part of that period of Armenian history, from the fall of the Arsacidae (428) to the rise of the Bagratides of the north (885), a space of 457 years, in which national decadence and servitude were the rule, governors appointed by the dominating power, first Persian marzbans, afterward Arab ostigans, holding sway, leaving however to the subject race the right to maintain a national militia. The time was opportune for Jezdegerd to press his designs, his Roman rival, now humiliated, being condemned to play the role of a neutral observer only.

A beginning was made with a persecution of Christians within Persia itself, where imprisonments, tortures and executions once more became the order of the day. From the fourth to the eleventh year of his reign (441-48) Jezdegerd was engaged on a campaign against the Asiatic Kushana, largely using Christian levies from Armenia and the Caucasus. To celebrate his victories he sent back to the fire-temples of Persia messengers with white bulls and mohair goats for sacrifice, honored many of the mokbeds, and ordered the confiscation of all Christian properties. In his eleventh year he issued an edict commanding all nations and tongues under his scepter to bend the knee to the Sun and to offer sacrifices to the Fire-God.

In the beginning of the ensuing year Jezdegerd marched once more against the Kushana, captured cities and strongholds of the enemy and pillaged his country, and, elated with his successes, took steps to make his edict effective. He placed a strong garrison at the Caspian Gate, the modern Derbent, with orders to permit no Christian troops, Armenian, Georgian or Albanian, with the armies of invasion to pass through back into their own lands, and sent the Christians off to the war in which many of

them lost their lives. The rest were put on reduced rations and made to winter in hard places.

Denshapur, Governor of Nishapur and a faithful agent of the King, then was dispatched to Armenia, ostensibly to take a census with the object of reducing the taxes and the military conscription, in reality to reorganize the country. Immediately upon his arrival he placed the Church under the Persian crown, enumerated all members of monastic orders with the rest of the population, imposed oppressive taxes, sowed dissension among the nobles, replaced a popular governor by a Persian tool, and invested a monk with the dignity of Chief Justice of the land. Presently there was received from the King's prime minister, Mihr Nerseh, a wordy letter setting forth the Mazdaean faith, confuting Christianity, and calling upon all Armenian notables, clerical and lay, to answer by letter or in person at Ctesiphon.

The Synod of Artaxata

Eighteen bishops of the Church, including the historian of the time, Elisiaeus, the polemic writer Eznik, with many chorepiscopoi, priests and laymen, met with the Catholicos Joseph in the capital city of Artaxata, to draw up a reply to the prime minister's communication. After setting forth the fundamentals of their Christian faith, they declared: "From this confession none ever can shake us, neither angels nor men, neither sword, fire, water nor any bitter tortures. All our goods and chattel we commit into your hands; our bodies also are at your disposal. Do as you will. If you choose to leave us in the free exercise of this faith, we on our part will exchange you for no other lord on earth; neither, however, will we own in heaven any other Lord than Jesus Christ only, besides whom there is no God."

But Jezdegerd who had worsted the Emperor in war, and subdued the Kushana, was not thus to be put off by a few provincials. Ten nobles of the Armenians, among them being the new Governor, the servile Vasak, Lord of Siunik, together with the Commander of the Armenian home forces, Vartan Mamigonian, were summoned to Ctesiphon. They arrived in Holy Week, and were coldly received, the King threatening that if they on the following morning, Easter Sunday, failed to worship with him the rising

Sun, they should all be subjected to torture until they changed their minds. In vain the nobles reminded Jezdegerd that since the time of his great-grandfather Sapor, when Armenia had come under the suzerainty of Persia, their countrymen had lived loyally under the scepter of the King of Kings, and that they themselves had served Jezdegerd even better, if that were possible, both by tribute and blood. The King replied all that was dross so long as the Armenians despised the Mazdaean faith, and offered the nobles their choice, either to obey his behest, or be sent in bonds to pathless wastes in Sacasdene, to perish in its deserts or pine in its dungeons. "And," said he, "I will dispatch to your country troops without number, accompanied by elephants, will deport your wives and children to Khuzistan, demolish your churches and monasteries, and cause everyone resisting to be trampled by the beasts." Instructions then were issued to the chief executioner to keep the men in custody, each however in his own quarters, and without chains.

The Armenians, on the point of being banished, as Georgian nobles similarly threatened had just been, weakened, worshipped the Sun, and offered the required sacrifices. Whereat the King was highly pleased, loaded them with gifts and honors, and sent them back to Armenia accompanied by troops and some 700 magi to disseminate the Mazdaean faith, while he himself went to the front to repel an irruption of the Ephthalites or White Huns who now replaced the Kushana upon the hostile stage. And these were the instructions as to the preliminary steps to be taken in the conversion of Armenia to Mazdaeism: Church services were to be discontinued forthwith, all churches closed and their furnishings forfeited to the crown. Priests were to be forbidden to instruct their parishioners from house to house, and the wives of the nobility together with all children of the land were to be instructed in the Mazdaean faith. Celibate orders were to be abolished, together with the Christian institution of marriage, and polygamy established "for the increase of the race." Meantime the whole Mazdaean ritual was to be strictly enforced. Food animals were not to be slain except by way of dedication to the Fire Deity. No dough was to be kneaded without a muffle (padan) over the face to prevent contamination by the breath.

Birds' droppings and cow-dung (common fuel of the poor) were not to be burned in the sacred element of fire, nor hands washed in the sister element of water without a sprinkling of the prescribed sanctifying cow's urine. Water-dogs (otters), foxes and rabbits, creatures of the Good God, Ahura Mazda, were not to be killed, while creatures of the Evil, Ahriman, such as snakes, lizards, toads and ants, together with all noxious insects, were to be hunted and brought in by number or measure. All this was to be observed until the New Year, when further instructions were to be issued.

Resisting unto Blood

Advised of what was on foot, the bishops hastily scattered to their various dioceses and sent out chorepiscopoi to warn and to hearten the people of villages, farms and mountain districts. At a town named Angl, in the heart of the country, one Sunday a Persian mokbed and his retinue laid violent hands on the church, whereupon the priest Leontius, with his parishioners, mobbed the intruders, and held mass in the sanctuary all day in the presence of overflowing congregations (449).

The mokbed was disposed to abandon the project. Vasak, however, the new Governor, determined to earn his title, brought up troops from his own home province of Siunik to overawe the populace. He also quartered magi on lavish allowances in the homes of the nobility, compelled the offering up and eating of pagan sacrifices, and winked at the depredations of Persian female camp-followers who raided churches, extinguished their lights, and tore dresses from worshipping women.

The bishops meantime called a popular convocation of the indignant laity, satisfied themselves of the loyalty of the Commander-in-chief, Vartan, despite his feigned apostasy, and through him won over many others of the military. Vartan's men pursued and rounded up the Persian soldiery, slew many and took more prisoners, while Vasak was seized, feigned a change of heart, and was set again free. Not a few fortresses in the hands of the Persians were reduced, and fire-temples destroyed. At this juncture also an Ephthalite raid penetrated the Atropatene, destroying on its progress many fire-temples. The prime-minister of Albania, how-

ever, with the Catholicos of the land, presently brought the Armenians word that a force of Persian cavalry from the war front had entered Albania accompanied by 300 mokbeds.

The Armenians appealed to the Emperor Theodosius, Vasak joining in the appeal in the hope of some day himself ruling over a reunited Armenia. Theodosius, however, died while considering the question of sending the Armenians help, and his successor, Marcian, upon advice of his general, Anatolius, decided not to intervene. The Armenians who thus were left to their fate, had now three armies in the field. One, under Nershabouh Remposian, operated in the south, in the districts of Her and Zarevand (the modern Khoy and Salmas); the second under Vartan Mamigonian guarded the northern approaches by the Caspian Gate and around the south-west coasts of the Sea whence a major attack of Persian war veterans might be looked for; the third, under the Governor, Vasak, was, like its leader, of doubtful loyalty, and soon reinforced with Persian recruits.

Vartan was at headquarters when the Governor of the Caspian Gate launched an attack. The Armenian took command of his army and met the enemy on the right bank of the Kur. The Persians were routed, the Albanian mountaineers rallying there-upon to Vartan's standard. The united forces marched to the Caspian Gate and captured it, and emissaries were sent to the Ephthalites proposing a military alliance. Meantime, however, Vasak was traitorously ravaging the cities and towns of Ararat province, not excluding Armavira and Artaxata.

By forced marches Vartan in thirty days returned to restore order, and compelled Vasak to flee to the fastnesses of Siunik, where his army was reduced to eating carrion. Vartan's victories of this time are still commemorated by the Church at Christmas, the month previous being observed as a period of fasting and prayer. Jezdegerd meanwhile returned from the Ephthalite war in which this time he had had scant success. It looked as if saner counsels might now prevail. He issued a proclamation granting amnesty to all Christian prisoners and restoring all confiscated property. The Persian, however, was only playing for time, for meanwhile he dispatched an embassy to the Emperor Marcian to

assure himself of the latter's pacific intentions, and once duly assured, continued to pursue his former plans.

Soon Jezdegerd was concentrating his veterans of the Ephthalite war on the north-eastern borders of Armenia, at the city of Barda. The Persian prime minister, Mihr Nerseh, massed the army, equipped with elephants, and when all was in readiness, turned it over to the commander-in-chief, Mushgan Nusalavoord. The purpose of this army was to cut off any possible help to the Armenians from the north, and joining up with Vasak's command and the Persian army of the south to bear down upon Vartan, who already was hastening eastward to meet the enemy. Vasak in the whole game played an important role. He reassured the Georgians, Albanians and other northern tribes, with fair words, and dispatched a messenger to the Emperor advising that the country was entirely united under him, that Vartan's movement was but a sectional rebellion unlikely to receive aid from the quarter of the Ephthalites, and that religion in no manner was involved in the controversy.

Avarair

When all was ready Vartan marched from Artaxata in a south-easterly direction, to join forces with Remposian, and with him strike at the enemy. Remposian meanwhile advanced northward, delaying as much as possible by a rear-guard action the southern forces of the enemy, now digging trenches, throwing up breast-works, erecting stockades and sending out foraging parties, while moving on toward the army of Mushgan.

On the eve of battle Vartan, having executed another of his swift movements, was on the plain of Ardaz, along the banks of the Muddy River, a small tributary of the Araxes, opposite Julfa. The field of battle seems to have been of his own choosing, by its size giving the advantage to the smaller army. He now read to his troops from the Books of Maccabees, and uttered such words as great generals have always known how to employ to brace the morale of their men. To us as students of the history of religion one thing that he said is eminently significant. "He who had conceived," he said, "that we wore our Christianity as one does his garments, now finds that he no more can divest us of it than he

can of the color of our skin, and, let us so hope, never will be able to the end." Mazdaeism notoriously was a state-supported faith, which died when that support failed it. But Jezdegerd was determined to impose it on Christian Armenia without the faintest conception of the native moral power of the religion he was trying to displace. In our own day an American woman has said the same thing Vartan said of Armenian religion. "It is not," she writes, "so much a guide in living, as life itself. It is dearer even than earthly life or hope of heaven; it goes deeper than the individual. It is the life of a race, the memories and traditions of generations of ancestors, and the immortality of a people on earth."¹¹ The priest Leontius also addressed the troops, denouncing the Persian peace propaganda, and calling the men to a renewed consecration to the Christian cause. The unbaptized received the rite of baptism and the communion was administered the whole night through.

The Persians, 300,000 strong, were deployed along the entire length of the plain, each 3,000 men in full armor supported by an elephant, Mushgan's body-guard consisting of the Immortals, a cavalry force so called from the fact that it was kept always at par by reservists riding up into the depleted ranks. Vartan's entire army, including Remposian's forces, horse and foot, numbered but 66,000. The year (451) was a fateful year, in which Attila ravaged the cities of Gaul, and the Council of Chalcedon met. The day, according to Ormanian, was May 26. It was the Armenian Thermopylae, without the advantage of position for the defensive. Mushgan succeeded in thrusting back the Armenian left wing. Vartan thereupon turned to the assault, crossed the river, put to flight the Persian Immortals, and encircled Vasak among his elephants. Simultaneously Vahan Ardzruni, commanding the Armenian right, rolled up the Persian left. But the Persian center held its ground, and in the hand-to-hand combat overwhelming numbers proved decisive. When the darkness at last put a period to the carnage, it was found, 1,036 Armenians, and 3,544 Persians had fallen. And Vartan was among the dead.

The Battle of Avarair, so called from a village of the plain, broke the Armenian military resistance, but not the spirit of the Armenian people. They retired to their castles and mountain fastnesses and continued the unequal fight. To one of the for-

tresses in which a number of the clergy, with the Catholicos Joseph and the priest Leontius, had taken refuge, Vasak and the Persian commander laid siege. The commandant of the fortress finding it inadequately provisioned evacuated it by night with 700 of his men, while the non-combatants to the number of 213, trusting to the enemy's fair promises, surrendered and were massacred, the clerics excepted, who got off for the most part with a beating.

Abandoning towns, villages and farms, the people retired to the mountains. "They," says our historian, "preferred to live in caves like wild beasts, in godliness, rather than softly, each in his own mansion, in apostasy. Uncomplainingly they submitted to a diet of herbs, choosing to forget their wonted viands. They accounted caverns of the earth as halls of storeyed buildings, and mats on the ground as gorgeous couches. Psalms were the burden of their songs, and the reading of the scriptures their perfect delight. Each was a church in his own person, himself the priest thereof, each body a holy altar, and every spirit an acceptable sacrifice. For none did mourn in despair them who had fallen by the sword, and none sighed with weeping over his own beloved dead. Gladly they took the spoiling of their ample goods, and never so much as recalled that they had had any earthly possessions." This was true of nobles and peasantry alike.

Vasak and his Persian confederates took all they could lay hands on, and set the torch to many undefended places. The loyalists retaliated by carrying the war into the enemy's own country. Mountaineers of the Caucasus swept down on the plain of the Acampsis, where the Persians had burned two village churches, and scattered their forces. At the other end of the country men of the north-eastern border kept appealing to the Ephthalites for help, until the latter swept in full force over the Caucasus, ravaged the Persian frontier districts, and carried off many captives.

The Persian Commander on returning home laid the blame for these calamities on Vasak. The latter accordingly was summoned to Ctesiphon, and with him the Catholicos Joseph, the priest Leontius, and a Bishop, Isaac of Rushdunik, known to have destroyed a fire-temple and roughly handled its attendants. Meantime, with the purpose of reassuring the public, the army of oc-

cupation was reduced, taxes remitted, a general amnesty proclaimed, complete religious freedom promised.

These measures inspired in the nobles sufficient courage to repair, in company with their ecclesiastics, to the capital, to lay their case before the King. They went, thirty-five in number, with a numerous retinue, leaving their wives and children behind as hostages with the new Governor. At a trial held before the court of the prime minister, documentary proof was produced of Vasak's dishonesty in the handling of public funds, of his secret correspondence with a foreign power, his aspirations to the throne of his country, and his instigation of needless bloodshed to further his selfish ends. Upon a certain day Vasak, all ignorant of the court's findings against him, came to a feast in honor of himself and all the nobles. He had donned his costliest raiments, his sable furs upon his back, his gold-embroidered cap and hair ornaments upon his head, his belt, of wrought gold set with pearls and precious stones, buckled on his waist, and with necklace and earrings bedecked; he repaired to the feast like another Haman. And, lo! the King's chamberlain enumerated the counts on which Vasak had been convicted in the Prime Minister's Court, the death penalty was pronounced upon him by the King, and the chief executioner, divesting him of his official robes, dressed him in the garb of a convict, and led him away, riding sideways on a mare, bound hand and foot, to his dungeon. There he was fed by charity, reduced to robbing the graves of his own ancestors to satisfy the exactor, until he died of foul disease, leaving behind him a name that stands in history beside those of Ephialtes and Benedict Arnold.

Jezdegerd, in the sixteenth year of his reign (453), went on his third Ephthalite campaign, leaving the Armenian nobles and clergy in bonds in the fortress of the city of Nishapur (near the modern Meshed), except for two priests that he took with him. Meantime, embittered by the sight of the Christians' sufferings, an Ephthalite by the name of Bel, of royal blood, who had transferred his allegiance to the Persian King, and was a secret inquirer after Christianity, fled to the king of the Ephthalites, and reported to him the persecutions he had witnessed, the revolts in the Persian army including the garrison at the Caspian Gate, and the

general discontent among the population. Hence the king of the Ephthalites the more willingly prepared to fight Jezdegerd who was coming against him with an army. He harassed Jezdegerd's forces by guerilla warfare, and sent out swift-moving marauding bands to lay waste the imperial provinces. The Christians again got the blame for the resulting Persian reverses, Jezdegerd ordering the two Armenian priests in his camp to be put to death, and leaving the prisoners at Nishapur indefinitely in chains. The Catholicos Joseph, the Bishop Isaac, and the priest Leontius, together with three other ecclesiastics who had taken prominent parts in fighting Mazdaeism and overthrowing fire-temples, and a mokbed converted to the Christian faith while in charge of the captives, were martyred at Nishapur. Not until after ten years of imprisonment under the most trying conditions were the remaining priests permitted to return home, or the nobles restored to the army under the King's personal assurance of an early release.

The death of Jezdegerd, however, intervened (457), his two sons plunging the country into a civil war for the succession. At the same time the King of Albania, a nephew on his mother's side of the Persian claimants to the throne, headed a revolt of eleven petty kings of the Caucasus. These events delayed the release of the Armenian nobles until the fifth year of the reign of Berosus (461).

During those long years of suffering and suspense, the heroism of the captives was matched only by that of their women folk at home. Elisaeus' eulogy of the wives is among the classics. Too lengthy to quote in full, it must be cited in part:

The wives of them who were in bonds bound voluntarily their fleshly desires in order thereby to become partners indeed of the holy captives in suffering. They bore in life the likeness of the brave martyrs in death, and became from afar the comforting teachers of those in prison. They labored with their fingers to earn their own livelihood, while year by year they sent the allowances they received from the royal treasury to them for their comfort. Indeed they bore in themselves the likeness of the bloodless crickets that live without food, by the sweetness of their song alone, and inhaling the air for sustenance are like unto the spirits of light.

Later History

Berosus himself was by no means friendly to Christianity. He sent word to the Catholicos Kiud (461-71) that he must do obeisance to the Sun on pain of losing his office. "Tell the King," replied Kiud to the messenger, "that I should be glad to be relieved of my temporal responsibilities, but that my Christian ordination neither he, nor any other prince or king, nor yet death itself, can divest me of." Kiud was deposed.

Given a bigoted king, another rebellion of his subjects was sure sooner or later to break out. Under the leadership of Vahan Mamigonian, a nephew of Vartan, taking advantage of Berosus' absence on Ephthalite campaigns, the Armenians raised the standard of revolt (481). No attempt was made at open warfare. That scarcely was possible under conditions then prevailing. Vahan's military operations are reminiscent of Gideon's, or David's in the days of his outlawry. Having at his back but a few men, at most from two to three hundred, he lived the life of a fugitive patriot, and did exploits.

Berosus was soon killed in battle with the barbarians and was succeeded by Valarsaces (Balash), a man of peace and good sense with whom the insurgents could treat. This King, after having suppressed insurrection by a son of the late Berosus, granted an audience to Vahan, who submitted three conditions of peace, as follows: (1) Complete religious liberty, with the removal of all fire-temples throughout Armenia; (2) the bestowal of civil offices on men of good character; (3) the placing of Armenia under the King's direct jurisdiction, with abolition of the former plan of administration at the hands of corrupt secondary officials with full powers. The Persian granted these demands, and returned Vahan to his own country with the rank of Commander-in-chief of the Armenian Militia (484).

The Catholicos, John Mandakuni (478-90), went out to meet Vahan in state, upon the latter's return, and celebrated the occasion with special services in the Cathedral Church of Etchmiadzin. Upon recommendation in the following year of the Persian Governor, Vahan was appointed Governor of Armenia, a great spontaneous popular celebration at the capital of Tevin following.

"Let the Jews," said the Catholicos, alluding to disloyalists, in a discourse, "let the Jews be silenced; let the apostates be ashamed; Adonijah hath fled who thought to reign without God, his henchmen are clothed with shame, they have sneaked away to hide themselves under the altar! 'They have reigned,' saith He, 'but not through me; covenants they have made, but not with my consent.'" The prelate concluded his words by commending clemency to the erring, and a Christian interest in the lost. When he had finished speaking, says the chronicler, weeping could be heard all over the sanctuary, some shedding tears of joy, others of penitential sorrow. At the conclusion of this celebration Vahan went over the country, visiting by turns all the provinces, overthrowing fire-temples and restoring churches, none opposing.

The reign of Valarsaces (484-88) was short. To promote popular cleanliness he built public baths, and so invited on himself the resentment of the mokbeds as a polluter of water. His eyes were put out, and he was succeeded by Kavadh I (488-531). Vahan governed Armenia twenty-five years, or until his death in 510. The years immediately following were comparatively uneventful, except for an irruption of the Ephthalites, who broke through the Caspian Gate and overran Armenia as far as Pontus and Cappadocia, devastating the country with fire and sword (516). The Armenians finally drove them out, under the leadership of the Lord of Sasun, Mjej Knuni, who in recognition of his prowess was bestowed (518) the general Governorship of Armenia.

In the year 527 there comes to the throne of the Byzantine Empire the great Justinian, who appointed an Armenian by the name of Dajat Military Governor of Roman Armenia, giving him to wife a sister of the Empress Theodora. Justinian who rebuilt the Cathedral of St. Sophia, in Constantinople, on a magnificent scale, during the incumbency of this Governor erected in the latter's territories besides cities and fortresses, numerous churches and monasteries.

In 552 (Year One of the Armenian Era) the Catholicos Nerses II (548-57) secured from Khosrov Anushirvan an edict prohibiting proselytism either to or from Christianity, it being provided that those who had turned from Mazdaeism to Christianity *must* return to their original faith, while Christians who had gone over

to Mazdaeism *might* return to theirs. Under this mandate, in the same year, a son of the Mokbed of Tevin (capital of Armenia since the fourth century), who previously had been converted to Christianity and baptized as Theodore, refusing to return to Mazdaeism, was summarily executed by crucifixion. In 556 an understanding similar to the foregoing was arrived at between Justinian and Khosrov, stipulating mutual religious toleration and a political truce of fifty years.

All agreements however were annulled when in 564 the Persian Governor of Armenia resorted again to persecution, and numerous forced conversions to Mazdaeism followed. This led to a combination of the Armenian nobles, headed by the younger Vartan Mamigonian, who appealed to the Emperor Justin II for help, raised a levy at Artaxata, marched upon Tevin, and put the Governor, garrison and magi to the sword (571). The Armenian resistance, however, breaking down, and Vartan with his nobles and their families fleeing to Constantinople, the Empire entered the war. The Roman forces under Marcian were swelled by Armenians of Roman Armenia, Mingrelians, Kakheti and Alani (Ossetians). Two armies were levied to operate against the enemy, the one in Persian Armenia, the other in Mesopotamia. The second drove the Persians before it as far as Nisibis, and invested that city. Marcian, however, at that juncture fell under suspicion, and was replaced by Theodorus, and the siege of Nisibis abandoned, whereupon Khosrov advanced upon Dara and captured it, and penetrating the territory of the Empire took and burned Melitene (Malatia). Reverse followed reverse to the Roman arms. The Emperor himself broke down physically and mentally, and abdicated, appointing Tiberius II to succeed him (572).

Thereafter Khosrov sent his armies into Armenia annually, the conflict dragging with alternating fortunes, and everywhere the Persians spreading devastation. Khosrov at last upon appeal of the Catholicos Moses II (574-604) relented, on the condition that Armenia would submit to Persian suzerainty and pay the regular tribute (578), and proceeded, having thus reduced Persian Armenia, to subjugate also the Roman portion of the country as far as Theodosiopolis. Upon the death of Khosrov in 579, the war

was continued by his son and successor, Hormizd IV (579-90), until the fortunes of Rome were retrieved by the Armenian Maurice, who defeated the Persians with great slaughter, and with the laurels of victory received the crown of empire (582). Maurice having restored peace to Roman Armenia, it passed into a saying among the people, "You sit carefree as in the days of Maurice."

Taking advantage of internecine strife in Persia, in which Khosrov II (590-628) had been deprived of his throne, Maurice dispatched to that country, under Armenian commanders, a force which restored the king to power. In gratitude Khosrov returned to Maurice Dara and Nisibis, sent to Constantinople a gold cross mounted with precious stones dedicated to St. Sergius (patron saint of the Christians of Persia), together with another originally given by Justinian and Theodora to the city of Sergiopolis and later captured by Khosrov I, and appointed an Armenian military commander, Smbat Bagratuni, Governor of Persarmenia and Virkana (Hyrkania).

In the last-named territory there dwelt a large colony of expatriated Armenians who had lost their language and letters and were alienated from the Church. These people Smbat made it his special concern to restore to their Church and people. He secured also permission from the King to rebuild with hewn stone the Church of Gregory the Illuminator in Tevin, which Vartan had built of brick and wood (594). When the Persian residents objected that the church interfered with the fortifications of the city, the King told them to remove the fortifications. After Smbat there followed an unbroken line of Armenian marzbans until the coming of the Saracens.

CHAPTER VI

THE EARLY DOCTRINAL WRITERS

Two books from this age, both of them doctrinal works of importance, have come down to us purporting to be from the pen of Gregory the Illuminator, but in their present form at least, to be assigned to the century following that of Gregory himself. The one of these books goes by the name of *The Teaching of St. Gregory*, the other is known as his *Discourses*.

The *Teaching* constitutes a full one-half of the History of Agathangelus, and is extant only in the Armenian, while the historical portion exists also in Greek. Both the *Teaching* and the *Discourses* are hellenistic in style, being evidently written by men who, whatever the language used in the originals, were trained in the Greek schools.

Both books could well have been written or edited by such men as Mesrop and Isaac, or by some other scholarly contemporary to us unknown, and several such were produced by their age. Evidently the *Discourses* were written at a time when monasticism was an established institution, pointing to the fifth century. Both *Discourses* and *Teaching* cite James and Hebrews, while the *Teaching* cites also 2 Peter and the Revelation, marks of a time later than the middle of the fourth century. Moreover, the numerous scripture quotations in both books (over 400 in the *Teaching*, and over one-half that number in the *Discourses*), are from that version of the Bible made in the first half of the fifth century. Where, as is the case in a small number of instances, they are not clearly paraphrases, indirect quotations, or allusions, they are either loose or free quotations of the Mesropian version, or approximately or identically the same with it. The comparatively small number of instances where there is a divergence of rendering may readily be explained as relics of a time, in the same first half of the fifth century, when the Mesropian version was yet in a plastic state, and being constantly revised in minor points.

Apparently when these books are written Manichaeism is abroad in the world, though a discreet silence is maintained as to

names. The *Teaching of Gregory*, in expounding the Christian cosmogony, glances at the Manichæan. For Manichæism, as a speculative system, had caught the fancy of the ancient world, and no Christian writer of the early centuries of our era could very well commend his religion to his readers who ignored that system or failed to offer a better substitute by comparison. If the dominating interest of ancient Christian theology is transcendental and speculative rather than practical, it will make us more lenient in our judgment of it at least to consider the apologetical necessities of the times.

The Teaching of St. Gregory

The *Teaching* is the classic handbook of Armenian Trinitarian Theology. It rapidly reviews Old Testament history as a prophecy of the Christ who is to come, and then takes up by turns the revelation in Christ, the Incarnation in fulfillment of prophecy, the testimony of John and the Baptism, the witness of Jesus' ministry and death, the Resurrection and the Forty Days, and finally Pentecost and the Apostolic message. The second half of the book is an exhortation to repentance, in which judgment is held to begin in this life and to come to its finality at the general resurrection.

Christ, according to the *Teaching*, is the agent of both the first and the new Creation. "The Word was from the beginning, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; and as all things were made through him, and through him all things in heaven and on earth were established, it behoved also that through him they should be cleansed through whom they were made and established, and through him they should be enlightened, God designing that his creatures should live and not perish."

At the very outset it is asked, "What is God?" And in a general way it is affirmed: "He surrounds all, and is beneath all, and above all, and outside all, and all is of him, and all is in him, and all is to his glory." This God who is both transcendent and immanent, is the Triune God. "One God, the Father and Lord and Creator of All, and the Only-Begotten Son who is from the Father, unto the Father and with the Father, and the Holy Spirit who is from his being and by whom he made all his creatures.

Which is one dominion, one power, one authority, one majesty, one understanding, one purpose, one sovereignty, one might without beginning, three perfect persons, one perfect will, incommunicable, inscrutable unity in trinity, one essence, one being, one divinity, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, three persons and one power of Godhead, the Father self-existent, the Son of the Father, and the Spirit both of them and in them, in his essence, his being, his deity, co-equal and uniform in the depths, in the heights, in the breadths, and in the lengths, one being in his essence, one crown of his Trinity, and heaven and earth are full of his glory."

But wherefore did this eternal and omnipotent God delay as he did the outworking of his redemption? "Wherefore did the Only-Begotten retard his coming, and so permit so much suffering among his creatures?" The writer replies: "To proclaim it in advance of the event, and so to make himself previously known to them, lest otherwise, coming on the sudden and unknown, he should fail of being received. He designed to come and announce himself to men who both had desired and expected him. For if he was rejected by his creatures when he came to them after so long a time, how much more surely would he have been rebuffed by those upon whom no previous impression whatever had been made?"

The Incarnation of Christ is thus set forth: "Though it was for us he descended to lowliness, yet he remains and continues in his own nature, even as he himself says, 'I am the same, and have not changed.' For though he took upon himself the image and flesh of man, yet did he mix, unite and merge that flesh with his deity." And again: "Though he assumed flesh, and descended to our likeness, yet he continues forever in that nature of his deity which he derives from the Father, even as he was, and is, and is to be, with his Father, in the heights of his nature, together with the flesh which he assumed from us, forever glorified by the angels of spirit and of fire." "And he was born of the Virgin, and by his own will performed the will of him that sent him. He says, 'I came to do the will of my Father,' to show the unity of his unitary, indissoluble, undetachable personality." In words like these we have the germ teaching of all Armenian Monophysitism.

As Christ was God in the flesh, it was nothing impossible to him to perform miracles. "He turned the water into wine to reveal his divinity; the same one who out of nothing made water in the nature of water, the same also at will turned the water into wine."

The Passion was of set divine purpose. "At that feast of types, he came with his disciples, to obey the law and to reveal the mysteries of the spiritual feast, giving to his disciples before his Passion his saving body and blood. Behold how of his own free will, and not by constraint, the Son of God suffers who is fed upon in advance of his Passion." The cry of dereliction from the cross reveals one who lays down his life of his own free will: "Now who is there among men that, his spirit being troubled at the point of death, lifts up his voice and cries aloud? Nay, rather, tongue-tied and silent are they before they breathe their last. But Christ the fortifier of souls, as he came to his death by a volunteering love, proclaimed aloud with awful signs given, that even in his death he was one in will and action with the Father, and made thus manifest his true death for the world by prophetic words spoken, 'My God, why hast thou forsaken me?' and 'Into thy hands I commend my spirit.'"

The converting power of the cross is not overlooked. "He lifted up his voice and cried, 'He that believeth on me believeth on him that sent me, and he that beholdeth me beholdeth him that sent me,' and having thus testified of himself in truth, confirming the Covenant, afterward did he go forth and surrender himself to a rebellious people; and this in order that those who had wandered away turning their backs to the light and life giving doctrine, might haply by handling him who by his sufferings gives life awake and come to reason." To a people in constant political bondage, a call to Christian liberty would be specially appealing: "That they might be delivered from the bondage of sin with that liberty which is above all liberties."

Along with this experiential factor of the atonement of Christ, there is recognized a physico-mystical peculiar to patristic theology: "He humbled himself and mingled his deity with our humanity, the immortal with our mortality, to the end that he might render all men incorruptible with that immortality which belongs to his deity who in the body ascended to the Father's

right hand to mingle us with his deity, and is the Only-Begotten Son, co-equal with God in power, by whose hand the foundations of the world were laid, and the expanse of the heavens stretched out."

The age was one in which martyrdom was held in high esteem. Of martyrs the writer says: "They saw the Lord, that he offered himself a sacrifice unto the Father; wherefore also they offered up themselves like lambs to the slaughter that in their turn they might be a sacrifice to the Son of God. For as the Son performed the will of the Father, so they also performed the will of the Son of God, who drew them to himself, and through them the whole world." The belief in the efficacy of the intercession of the saints naturally follows from this: "Their bodies and their bones are temples of God in our midst; neither will aught avail to reconcile God to you or to bring you nigh unto him like the intercession of their prayers." How the patristic Church reconciled such doctrine as this with the complete efficacy of Christ's salvation, is a question we here need only ask.

There is a good philosophy of missions. The writer inquires why Jesus told his disciples to pray the Lord of the harvest to send laborers into his harvest, and concludes that it was to stir up their love for their fellow men. "Self-love is the opposite of altruism, it is selfishness, and as such is not pleasing to the Creator, seeing that through it sin at the first entered the world. As therefore the Deity is a lover of mankind, he took them into his confidence, to teach them the love of their kind, whereby they should go forth inviting and pleading with the world and raising laborers for their Lord's harvest."

The Discourses of St. Gregory

The *Teaching* is a careful working over of the biblical material bearing on the deity of Christ, and a literary gem. The *Discourses* are in a more free-and-easy style, and deal with the general body of Christian doctrine.

The people are warned against all heresies. "It is not meet to seek after the sects, or to wander among them to one's perdition." The writer aims to point his readers "to the one only true and living hope, that they may not stray after false opinions and the

lying, deceiving words of heretics and sectaries, but, understanding the truth of the divine traditions of the Holy Scriptures in their actual sense, and separating themselves from all vain opinions, may turn their minds ever upward toward the eternal felicities." The age was one of heresies, running the whole gamut from Arian Unitarianism to the fantastic speculations of the Manichaeans.

The great mystery of ethics and of theology, the origin of evil in the world, is attributed to the exigencies of human freewill. Forced good were no good at all; the necessities of the good itself demanded a free agent, with the implied possibility of evil. "How comes it, say they, that evil emerges, instead of a uniform good? In the latter case the praiseworthiness of the self-determining will would vanish, the election of the righteous also come to naught, and the good itself would be deprived of the rewards of the Judgment with its glories."

The Cross of Christ is a revelation. "He showed the invisible in the visible, by his voluntary death, that is, upon the cross, to reconcile the Creator unto his creatures." The character, however, of this reconciliation is subjective rather than objective, consisting in a work of grace in man rather than in a God made gracious: "He saves men from their sins by removing all suffering from mankind through his own sufferings, through his manifold favors and through the promises of the good things of God making them worthy of the Father's care and of the Holy Spirit's graces." There is no clear-cut doctrine of the atonement, except the patristic one, that original sin is done away by the Cross, while actual sins are remitted through the sacraments. "Now sins and manifold wickednesses, visible and invisible, like their agent Satan, were not in the beginning, but entered in through the Traducer, who caused us to fall into them. Neither are they now, seeing the life-giving Lamb was offered up as a sacrifice upon the cross for the removing of sins and the reconciliation of the Father with his creatures, bestowing life on us who believe in the Holy Trinity by the new birth of the font, and by the saving sacrament."

Repentance and faith have a place in the body of doctrine, but are not directly linked up with the redemptive work of Christ. "Repentance is to blame oneself, to renounce hurtful things and

evil desires, and to oppose to one's several sins righteousness, to the end that this may uproot sins, and cause right things to grow through holy love and tearful prayers, drying up, with fasting, the turbid and impetuous stream of filthiness which is a corruption in the members." "Faith is a treasure that cannot be stolen from us; it holds within it all good things, through grace revealing the blessings of salvation and eternal life, that so we may enjoy in hope all the felicities, for it holds up as before our very eyes the fair-flowered felicities of hope that we may not be forgetful of the Judgment whereby we shall be admitted to the unending bliss prepared for the saints." Faith as it were is the middle term between present duty and future hope. "As the body rests on the lower limbs, so faith rests on good works, while in turn it confirms hope, and hope Judgment."

With this view of faith goes a doctrine of salvation through good works, including the sacraments. "By tearful prayers and generous almsgiving and all good works, including the sacrifice of Christ, we may bring God to a reconciliation with ourselves, and afford comfort to the departed in the other world."

Among the prescribed good works are fasts. "Fasts do quench the burning fire of desire; for as fire is extinguished for lack of fuel, so the flame of desire is extinguished through the craving for food and drink being brought under restraint, while the flame of holiness and righteousness burns the hotter for being fed by a fast." Fasting is a good device against temptation. "For as carrion-eating birds become weak for flight from eating unrestrainedly, and are thus easily captured by hunters to their undoing, while those eating sparingly are of swift flight and impossible of capture to fowlers setting the snare for them, so are we to understand severally of those indulging their appetites, and of those eating in moderation, during holy fasts." But a word of qualification is added: "In saying this, I would not withhold from the sick and the feeble the sparing use of wine according to the apostolic injunction to the feeble and the aged concerning the stomach and one's oft infirmities. But let those who are strong and youthful abstain from flesh and wine in order that they may not be easily snared by the ever-watchful foe and captured by him to do his will."

If salvation is thus made effective through our own good works, then all human help necessarily must be welcome. "There is this gain of the common hope, that those gone before are made glad by the good works of those left behind, while those left behind are made strong by the fulfilled hope of those gone before." Material aid can be rendered by the saints in glory to the saints on earth by their intercessions and their relics. "By their faithful labors they offered up their bodies as a sacrifice on the earth for the name of God and for a sweet smell, and now their holy spirits by their spiritual intercessions do bring God to have mercy on the world, while the relics of their bones bestow saving gifts in the congregations of believers as all know, the love of God appearing to reside in them and being proclaimed to all the earth by its signs."

The writer would commend to all and sundry the virtue of meekness, which "disciplines the poor unto patience, and makes the strong wise to wield worldly power undistraught and undisturbed, and in fact is modesty itself in all relations toward all, and an educator of great and small." "This is quite evident that not the pride of noble birth is esteemed before God, but the aristocracy of noble character. For in Armenia, as also in Persia, there is none greater than the House of the Arsacides, who descend from Abraham, as do all kings of the nations of the earth, according to the word of the Lord of all the earth, which cannot lie. But if they do not come to reason, to do well, they shall receive the greater penalties from the Lord, such of their servants as are well-pleasing to God shall be made kings and shall be glorified by the Lord in their stead, while they themselves, under debt to sin, shall be punished by righteous laws."

To attain to the stature of Christ must be the Christian's ever-present aim. "As the Son of God became a Son of Man, assuming our own nature, and performed all righteousness in both spirit and body, even so let us also put on truth and perform all righteousness in Christ, to the end that we may become sons of God, and gods, in love." Toward the attainment of this ideal, "honorable wedlock" is as much to be esteemed as celibacy. No human being at all needs go to hell, a place originally prepared not for us but for the Devil and his angels. The life to come is bright with

hope, so that those who, with pagans, wail and cut themselves for the dead, can only "make God angry."

Eznik: The Sects Refuted

From the fifth century we have a book of a controversial character by Eznik, Bishop of Bagrevand, bearing the title, *The Sects Refuted*. The sects discussed are: (1) Pagans, (2) Parsees, (3) Philosophers, and (4) Marcionites.

1. *Pagans*. The controversy with pagans is over the origin of evil. Whence is evil, physical and moral?

The pagan, says Eznik, holds that matter has a being independently of God, and that God from a part of it made what is good, the rest, which he could not use, becoming evil. To which he replies that it is impossible that there should be two several uncaused Entities. If God is in all of matter, or in a part of it, then matter is greater than God. And if God is neither in all nor yet in a part of matter, then there must be a third somewhat shutting them out from each other, greater than either. And if matter is in God as a body is in space, then God himself is the seat of evil. All these three alternatives alike are unthinkable.

The pagan contends that moral evil is not from the will but from nature. If that be so, the writer asks, why does civil law prescribe penalties for wrong-doing, or men generally seek vengeance? Wrong-doers themselves, it is evident, do not like to be called by their right name, so that the best way to bring bad princes to rectitude is to flatter them. Not only men, but animals even, called evil, in certain circumstances may be made to serve good purposes, while wild animals may be tamed, showing that they are not inherently evil.

Eznik holds that God is sovereign. To make matter, said to be constituted of four self-existent elements, the ultimate seat of evil, were to make it co-equal with God, it following from this that God is not even two (Parsee doctrine), but five. The true secret must be sought in a God who respects human freedom, a God who is the uncaused Universal Cause and Sustainer, who gives beauty, but leaves it to us to achieve goodness.

That God is not the author of sin, we know from the fact that he attaches penalties to it. Acts become evil through motives

and consequences, by the exercise, that is, of freedom. Nature itself has no freedom and obeys all laws laid down by the Creator, but man is a free rational being, deriving his profit from obedience and his loss from disobedience. It was not the nature or make-up of the forbidden fruit that caused man's death, but man's own disobedience to the divine command. Evil is whatever is done against the will of God. Satan was the original author of evil, neither created evil by God nor yet by him designed to tempt man, and not an uncreated being in opposition to God, but a creature in deliberate revolt against God. He had no prescience, nor absolute power over man, but God permitted the freewill of Satan and the freewill of man to engage in a fair and equal fight for the mastery. God knew in advance how Satan would turn out, but made him as an example to man of his own goodness to the sinner, and also to teach man how to strive against sin and win.

Death, far from being an unmixed evil, often releases man from evil. Nor is evil, whether physical or moral, always the direct effect of sin, but sometimes of a failure to maintain the even balance of nature or keep the natural and legitimate passions under control. Evil in the form of the divine chastisements may be for a warning, or for retribution, and may be removed by the divine power.

Pagans reason that the Universal Cause is unapproachable, wherefore we must needs worship It through the medium of subordinates, to be placated by gifts and sacrifices. Eznik asks why, if one but admit that the Ultimate Cause is One, Self-existent and Eternal, one should worship that which has none of those attributes. Second causes, having no consciousness, neither can receive worship. All mutation and movement has a Cause behind it, and it is to that Cause, not to the effect, that we must needs render worship.

2. *Parsees*. Persian Mazdaeism gives God two sons. Before ever the world was created, there was one named Zervan, meaning Fortune, or Glory. He for a thousand years offered sacrifices in the hope that he would have a son who should create the heavens and the earth; but at the end of that period he doubted and, behold, he had brought forth twins, Ormuzd and Ahriman, the first given in answer to his sacrifices, the second in requital for

his doubting. The son of his doubt presenting himself first before the father, the latter, pursuant to a previous vow, gave him the kingdom for 9,000 years, at the expiration of which term the son of faith was to take the rule. The two now began to create, and whatever Ormuzd made was good, and all that came from the hand of Ahriman was evil.

Eznik proceeds to point out that this is the same sort of doctrine, with but the births added, as that of Manes, who taught that there is a root of good and a root of evil. If then, he asks, the two cults are essentially the same, why do the Zoroastrians so hate the Zends? Both in fact believe in the double root, both worship the Sun, and both are animists, the only difference between them being that the Manichaeans are ascetic in their habits, while the Zoroastrians indulge their instincts.

The writer then proceeds to ask, Was this Zervan as conceived a perfect being? If so, whom did he beg for a son, and wherefore did not he himself make the heavens and the earth? And if there was one above him who possessed the attribute of perfection, why did not that one himself act the part of Creator? It is said that Zervan sacrificed to "Glory." Now if this quality called "glory" was one bestowed upon him by another, then surely that other should have claimed the sacrifices, and if not, even so there was no need of any sacrifices, for "glory" was not a personal entity separate from Zervan, but a quality of his only. As to the sacrifices themselves, if in the beginning there was no sun or moon, how then were 1,000 years computed, and if there was no earth or sky, what was the material of the sacrifices?

Zervan is impossible! If as we are told he doubted, he himself, rather than Ahriman, was the origin of evil; and, pray, how can the self-same tree bring forth both good and evil fruit, or the same fountain pour out both sweet water and bitter? If the creatures, forsooth, remain each within his own bounds, and produce after their own kind, so that even when from the horse and the ass man breeds the mule the last-named remains sterile, how much more should Zervan have produced after his own kind only? Zervan in truth is a hybrid, one of the Titans, and just as Greeks and Aryans and all pagans are wont to turn heroes into demigods, so the Parsee "tinker of religions" makes out Zervan a father with

human passions, and at the same time the Creator of heaven and earth. But if the reader wishes to know the truth, Zervan is neither creature nor creator, but nothing at all. For if he be father of both the evil and the good, then is he himself both good and evil, which certainly sets the father of the gods in a self-contradictory light. To sum up this system, "one who was not, offered sacrifices to one who was not, for one who was not"!

As to Ahriman, he is evil, not because he is inherently such, but because, even as this system acknowledges, he wills so to be. "It is not that I am unable, but that I am unwilling to do the good." In proof of the truth of this there is the tenet that Ahriman created the light and the peacock, both of them certainly beautiful and good.

There is much mythology that our writer has no difficulty in confuting, the less that the religion of the Zendavesta, not being committed to writing in the people's own language, has become the plaything of vulgar fantasy. To cite one piece of mythology, when Ormuzd was at the point of death, he cast his seed into a fountain, whence toward the end of the world it was to bring forth a Virgin who should bear a Son who should smite many of the hosts of Ahriman, plainly a hope already fulfilled in Christ. The whole Zoroastrian dualism is pronounced wrong-headed and self-contradictory. If, for instance, the four fundamental elements, fire and earth, air and water, be Ormuzd's creation, how do the evil creatures of Ahriman also subsist therein, breathing the same air and drinking the same water with the creatures of Ormuzd?

Eznik argues against the magian astrology, discrediting the notion that the stars determine the destinies of men. This brings him to a discussion of fate. Fate is not the controlling thing in the world. "Or when the invader enters the land to despoil and destroy it, men would not levy troops and muster armies to drive him out. They must rather justify him, saying that it is ordained for the world to be destroyed by the invader, and it does not behove them to go against the higher mandate. No, but rather levying troops and driving the enemy out of the land, men indicate that it is not by a foreordained fiat that any slaughter takes place, but through the violence of the invader himself who, driven by his lust for spoil, destroys the land and strips it of goods and

chattel." Indeed God foreknows events, but foreknowledge is not an efficient cause, nor annuls freewill. "It is clear that when God says, 'Jacob I loved but Esau I hated,' he well knew in advance that the former would be loved for his own conduct, and the latter hated for his own. The Apostle plainly asserts that Esau was hated by reason of his own conduct: 'Let no one be a fornicator, or unclean person, like Esau, and let none appear as a root of bitterness, and thereby torment others.' He thus makes plain that Esau became hated by his own freewill, and not through constraint of any of God's other creatures. As is said elsewhere, God made men upright, but men have thought out devices of wickedness. And God declares by the prophet, 'I planted you a comely vine, and how turned you away from me unto bitterness, O vine laid waste!'"

3. *Philosophers.* The Greek philosophers put God first, but make mind a second cause after him, and spirit a third, which last they call the universal spirit. "In referring the two last to the One Cause, they appear to approach the gates of the knowledge of the truth; but in creating from them by generation other innumerable gods that may be heard and seen, they do themselves shut to the gate of the knowledge of the true faith. For they compare God, and the gods that one hears and sees, respectively to the Sun and his rays, and make out the whole world to be co-eternal with God, and his spirit the breath of all things, including the heavens and their luminaries, fire and air, water and earth, down to stones and sticks, trees, roots and grass. By that life principle, say they, all creatures depend on his being, just as the rays of the sun depend on his disc, so that the sun is one and yet many, many and yet one, one and at the same time many, one disc and many rays. Not all, understand, so put the matter, for there are many religions among the philosophers."

To begin with the Pythagoreans and the Peripatetics, these assert the unity of God, and his providence, and disapprove of sacrifices to the gods. Pythagoras forbade the eating of animal flesh and the drinking of wine. He held everything "from the moon up" immortal, everything beneath mortal. He taught the transmigration of spirits, prescribed silence, and ended up by calling himself God. According to the Platonists, there is a God;

there is also matter, and substance or essence. They regard the world as created and destructible, God having fashioned the world out of matter, which rather makes him out, says Eznik, an artisan God. Breath is uncreated, immortal and divine, having a threefold aspect, the rational, the choleric and the amative. Free love is taught, and the transmigration of spirits. There is a multiplicity of gods, all having the same origin. The Stoics regard everything as corporeal, and the visible world as God, some of them making fire the essence of God. They define God as mind, and regard him as the breath or life-principle of heaven and earth, while all that is visible is his body, the heavenly luminaries being his eyes. Physical bodies are perishable, and spirits are subject to transmigration. Last of all, the Epicureans hold the world to be self-sustaining, and teach that all matter in the beginning was in one mass, in the shape of a mist, and that from this mist everything that is evolved. They believe that happiness is in desire, or pursuit. There is no God, and no ruling providence.

Eznik deems the desire to find God through the laws of nature a praiseworthy one, but condemns polytheism and the opinion that creation is co-eternal with God. The philosophers, he thinks, would have better honored God had they sought to explain the Creator by his creation, instead of identifying him with it. If the heavenly bodies be gods, wherein are the gods more than their creatures? Especially if the creatures have their breath in common with their Creator, while the breath of the higher orders in no essential respect differs from that of the lower, and one half of the divine spirit is in conflict with the other half, how is the universe rationally explained? "In vain, then, do the wise men of Greece attempt to tell us about God, for the reason that they are unable to distinguish between the Creator and his creatures, and, being darkened with demonic darkness, idly introduce many births of many gods."

When he comes to discuss astronomy Eznik is not so fortunate. He contends that the sun hides himself, and is not in another part of the heavens, at night; that night is not the effect of the earth being left in its own shadow; that the heavens are not greater than the earth; that the moon shines in her own light, and that eclipses are not caused by interposition of moon or earth. "And

again," says he, "if an eclipse of the sun be caused by a conjunction of the moon, when the moon herself is darkened what happens to her? If an eclipse of the moon be caused by her conjunction with a star, lo! we can see no star in the heavens so large in magnitude that in any conjunction with the moon it would suffice to hide the latter from our view, neither is there any star lower than the moon that could come in under the moon and eclipse her. And if the moon were to intercept the light of the sun, then should she shed her own light upon the earth, making the day at least moonlit, and not complete darkness!" Eznik here has the same difficulty as any churchman of our time who oversteps the bounds of his own specialty.

4. *Marcionites*. Marcion placed matter alongside of God, and conceived three heavens, one above the other, and matter as being the "power of the earth." The highest of the three heavens in his system is inhabited by an alien order of beings and an alien God, the one next lower by the God of the Law (of Moses), while the lowest heaven is peopled by the latter's "hosts." Beneath is the earth. Marcion explains the earth in terms of the Law, but holds that the God of the Law, having made all things in co-operation with Matter, his spouse, ascended with his hosts on high, leaving Matter and her progeny on the earth. Thus Matter bore rule over the earth, while the God of the Law ruled the heavens.

The origin of sin is thus explained. God seeing the earth beautiful, desired to create man on it, and descending to earth, said to Matter, 'Give me clay, and I will provide of my Spirit, and together we will make man after our own likeness, yours and mine.' Thus were man and woman made, and the God of the Law and Matter rejoiced over their common progeny. But the parents were mutually jealous over them, God seeking to induce them to love him, while Matter strove to lure them away from God, presenting to them many gods (idols), among which man effectually lost his Creator. For this cause God cast man and his race for 2,900 years into the abyss.

The God of the highest heavens, until now an "alien" or "unknown" God, took pity on humankind, and sent down his Son to save them. To Him he said, Heal the lepers, raise the dead, open the eyes of the blind, until the Lord of Creation, the God

of the Law, seeing your deeds, is provoked to jealousy, and crucifies you. Then having died, you will descend into the abyss and bring up the children of men; died, not in fact, but in appearance, thus deceiving hell which neither admits nor is able to retain the living.

When, then, the God of the Law had crucified the Son, the latter descended into hell and spoiled it of its prisoners, taking their spirits with him up to the third heaven, to his Father. Whereupon the God of the Law seeing what was done was angered, tore his garment, the veil of the Temple, in twain, darkened the Sun, and went into mourning, causing the world to go into mourning with him. Jesus then came down a second time in the form of his Deity, and brought suit against the God of the Law for his death. For the first time then the latter knew that there was another God beside himself. And to him Jesus said, There is a cause between us, and no one else shall settle it but your own Law, under which, as a murderer, you are due to die. The God of the Law then pleaded that he had committed his crime ignorantly, not knowing that the Son was God, and offered the latter compensation in the form of a warrant to take all them that should believe on him. Jesus then forgave the God of the Law, snatched up Paul to the third heaven, and revealing to him how men had been bought with a price, commissioned him to preach the gospel.

Here is a cunningly devised fable, an attempt at a synthetic religion, harmonizing pagan, Jewish and Christian thought and speculation somewhat in the style of modern Mormonism. What is Eznik's answer to it?

If, he says to begin with, this "alien" God was God in reality, he should have made his own creatures and not coveted those of another. As to the God of the Law, if he indeed is creator, how comes he to need a helper in his work? The votaries of Marcionism, professing to trust in God and in his Son Jesus, do at the same time urge men to revere others besides, notably the God of the Law, very much as if a servant of the Roman Emperor should be constrained to serve the Persian Sassanian monarch, and vice versa. And how, pray, he asks, did Marcion know the nature of Paul's vision, when Paul himself declares it was incommunicable?

The Marcionite system is full of moral difficulties. Among the

gods it introduces unworthy rivalries, and makes out a God of the Law to be the originator of Evil. If, too, the good God was so compassionate as represented, why does he permit the souls of men to suffer in hell 2,900 years before he will bestir himself to accomplish their salvation? As to Jesus, he is represented in the light of a transgressor of the Law in that he intrudes into the domain of the God of the Law, making void the Law and the Prophets, and how in justice is he thereafter entitled to call the Law to his aid or seek judgment against the adversary? And, forsooth, if his incarnation and death were in appearance only, how was his redemption real? And if the "alien" God had the power to save men in prison, why did not he accomplish this by main force, instead of resorting to subterfuge and sacrifice? And lastly, if hell does not receive the living, then how comes it that the Devil and his angels are there?

Marcionite doctrine sets up a false antagonism between the Law and the Gospel. These are not contrary the one to the other, for they both are from the same God, and the one but completes the other. The Marcionite practice of eating fish and abstaining from flesh is unscriptural; so is the condemnation of marriage as unclean, and so likewise are the denial of the resurrection of the body, and the practice of baptism in the behalf of deceased candidates. The argument is climaxed by a reflection on Marcion's personal character. He was a native of Pontus, the son of a Bishop. According to common fame, his own father excommunicated him for the sin of fornication, whereupon he fled to Rome seeking repentance, and finding none, turned against the faith.

In dealing with these four types of heresies, Eznik is contending against cults more or less influential in his own time and land. If the order of treatment, and the space devoted to the four severally may be taken as an index, then the current paganism, and Persian Mazdaicism, had the field, with Greek philosophy and the Marcionite heresy commanding a smaller following. In this little treatise whose literary merit is not behind its theological, we see through what darkness of error early Armenian Christianity came out into the light and carried off at last the palm of victory. Nor should we omit to say, however trite the observation, that it was not on the field of battle, but in the field of thought, that Armenia's great victory for Christianity was won.

CHAPTER VII

THE ARAB DOMINATION

THE child Jezdegerd III came to the throne of Persia in 632, the year of Mohammed's death. After the battle of Cadesia in 637, the country fell completely under the dominion of the Arabs who governed it through their ostigans.

In those times of disruption, the Catholicos Ezras prevailed upon the Emperor Heraclius to appoint a Governor of his own over Greater Armenia, thus incorporating it into the Empire. David Saharuni's tenure, however, as Curopalates of Armenia, was of short life, the nobles expelling him from the country (634). As they themselves were disunited, a period of anarchy ensued.

In the time of the Caliph Omar, by way of a side excursion to a Persian campaign under Saad, a force of 18,000 Arabs commanded by Abdurrahim entered Armenia from the south. A contingent of 8,000 Armenians sent against them was annihilated, the invaders overrunning the districts of Taron and Pasen, and the provinces of Ararat and Vaspuragan (640). Tevin, capital of Persarmenia and seat of the Catholicos, was captured, 12,000 non-combatants put to the sword on the Armenian Christmas, and 35,000 driven off into captivity (641). Ezras himself died of a broken heart. In the same year, at the battle of Nehavend, the Arabs put an end to the Sassanian empire.

For the ensuing ten years (642-52), following unsuccessful incursions into Ararat (Erivan), Vaspuragan (Van) and Nakhichevan provinces, the Arab raids ceased. Not, however, the contest between Caliph and Emperor for the sovereignty of Armenia. In 646, upon an invasion of the Arabs, the Armenians offered to pay the Caliph tribute. This brought down upon them the wrath of the Emperor Constans II, who now in his turn invaded Armenia. Constans was placated by the intercessions of the Catholicos Nerses III and his clergy. Accepting of the prelate's hospitality at Tevin, he compelled the Armenian clergy to hold a union eucharistic service with the Greeks. But being recalled suddenly to Constantinople, he left behind him an army that what

with their loose morals and their contempt for Armenian religious prejudices, in no way helped to conciliate the Armenians, who finally drove the Catholicos himself from his Chair.

In 648 Constans appointed the Patrician Vasak Governor of Armenia. Vasak three years later signed an alliance with the Arabs, with the result that the Emperor now took steps to reduce Vasak. This served as a signal for a bloodless occupation of the country by the Arabs under Muavié. The Armenians now promised to submit to the Moslems and renounce all allegiance to the Greeks, to begin after seven years to pay tribute as they were able, and quarter 15,000 Arab horsemen. In return the Arabs promised freedom of conscience, military aid against the Greeks, the right of maintaining a horse militia for home service only, exclusion of all Moslem officials from the civil service, and acceptance of tribute in kind when offered (651). In token of good faith the Armenians gave hostages, both men and women, to the number of 1,775. Toward the end of the seven-year period, however, so heavy was the tribute exacted that in 656 the Armenians repudiated their allegiance to the Caliph and returned to the Empire. The Caliph Ali retaliated by putting the hostages to the sword, and was making preparations for an invasion of Armenia when a mutiny of his own troops terminated his life (661). His successor, Muavié, who was wiser in the governing of conquered territories, won the willing submission of the Armenians, who once more renounced their allegiance to the Empire.

In the first year of the Catholicos Isaac III (677), the Arabs again invaded Armenia. The incursion followed a line clear through into Georgia, where finally they were repulsed with great slaughter. To add to the troubles of the Armenians, in 683 the Khazars broke into their country from the north. This menace disposed of, the Armenians again (685) signed a treaty with the Arabs, promising tribute. This incensed the Emperor Justinian II, who, refusing all explanations, invaded Armenia with a heavy military force, laid waste twenty-five cantons, carried off into captivity 8,000 households, and left behind him 40,000 troops for an army of occupation (688).

The Arabs, not to be outdone by the Greeks, in 689 once more entered the country from the south-east, reduced many fortresses,

laid waste more towns, and carried off numerous captives. On a second incursion, the same year, they penetrated as far as Lake Sevan. Justinian, on a counter invasion in the ensuing year carried off a number of sons of the nobility for hostages, leaving behind him an army of occupation of 30,000 men. The Arabs came back in 693, setting up their headquarters at Tevin. Abdallah, their commander, put nobles and citizens in bonds, confiscated their properties, and sent the Catholicos Isaac, and the Commandant, Smbat Bagratuni Purad, to Damascus in chains. Abdallah robbed all the churches of Ararat province of their plate and furnishings, and taking David of Tevin, of Persian royal blood and convert to Christianity, nailed him to a cross.

The Armenians endured Abdallah as long as they could, and then with the help of a Greek contingent rose up and annihilated his 5,000 men. The Caliph Abdul Malik answered by sending his general Okba against them (702). Okba's forces were defeated with great slaughter, the Arab barely escaping with a few of his horsemen. The Caliph then raised a great army with which to destroy the rebels root and branch. The captive Catholicos was advised of the dire danger threatening his country by the Armenian Governor who begged him to see Okba and make an attempt to turn him from his dark purpose. The aged prelate accordingly, securing the necessary permit, set out for Okba's camp, but having reached as far as Harran, took sick, and, being at the point of death, rose from his couch and wrote out in Arabic a petition which he directed his attendants to place in his lifeless hand and thus to present him to the Arab commander. The document read in substance: "I bear in my hand the written contract by which my people promise to pay tribute to the Caliph and obey him as their overlord, you on your part agreeing to deal with them righteously, accepting tribute and obedience, nor laying waste in anger the land of my people as if it had been the land of an enemy. Now if your heart will be kind toward us (according to this contract), and you will forgive the unpremeditated rebellion of my people, then the Lord Himself will establish the throne of your King, and upon yourself will descend the blessing of your father Ishmael. But if you shall disregard my entreaty,

the Lord also will turn back from you the hearts of your own men, and the goings of your feet will not be divinely directed."

Okba came into the presence of the dead greeting him as if he were living, took from the cold hand the message addressed to him, read it, and relented. So, it was said, the dead Catholicos accomplished that day more for his people than many a one living. Isaac was taken back to Tevin for burial with an escort of Moslem troops, and the captives held for over ten years in Damascus were set free (703).

With a change of Caliphs, however, there came a reversal of policies. Under Walid's caliphate people were lured into their churches and burned alive, 800 nobles and commoners in one church in Nakhichevan alone; whole families were carried off into captivity. Among those deported was Susan Gamsaragan, a woman of rank, who had fed and clothed some Arabs escaping from the late unsuccessful encounter with the Christians. For this kindness Susan was rewarded (708) by being tortured to death in a prison at Harran. The act has caused some discussion. Why was it perpetrated? Possibly the object was to serve a warning to all Christians to refrain from all acts of kindness to Moslem fighting men that might undermine their *morale*.¹² Such events caused men of Tevin, Arabs as well as Armenians, to band themselves together in defence of their city against the Arab soldiery. The city, however, through the treachery of an Arab youth, was soon compelled to surrender to the foe, many of its Christian inhabitants of both sexes being carried off to Damascus.

John of Otzun

It was for such times as these that John of Otzun, surnamed "The Philosopher," came to the Catholicate. Upon him devolved the securing of a better mutual understanding between Arab Caliph and Christian subjects. Circumstances were opportune during the brief reign of the Caliph Omar II (717-20), who, having heard his fame for learning and sanctity, summoned and received him with distinguished honors. The Catholicos is described as broad shouldered, stately of stature, of florid complexion, beard just turning gray growing down into his coat pockets, a man interesting and beautiful to behold. He answered the royal

summons as was expected in official garb. His vestments shone with the rich hues of the dyer's trade; his well-groomed beard glittered with gold dust made adhesive with sweet-smelling ointments; in his hand he carried a pastoral staff of ebony inlaid with gold. At sight of him the Caliph was not more delighted than he was puzzled. "Does not your Christ," asked he of the prelate, "teach you simplicity in dress?" "He does, Your Majesty," replied the Christian; "but forasmuch as, having lost the gift of miracles, we now have no other way of impressing common folk, we must needs resort to these artifices." And then observing that the Caliph was not even yet entirely convinced, he asked him to put forth his attendants for but a little while, which done, he divested himself of his outer garments, laying bare to the Caliph's view the goat's hair tunic he wore next the skin. "The outer garments," he explained, "are for outward show; this I wear to cover my nakedness withal." The Moslem knitted his brows, handled the goat's hair cloth, and murmured, "No human flesh verily could endure such austerities unless Allah should give one the endurance!" The Caliph offered John anything he might ask. The Catholicos asked only freedom of conscience for his people, freedom of worship, and exemption from taxes for churches and clergy. These readily were granted, and, besides, all captives were set free. The Catholicos himself was returned back home loaded with gifts of gold and silver and gorgeous apparel.

Continued Misrule

In the middle of the eighth century Armenians were still playing a not inconsiderable part in the fortunes of empire. While Artavastes, the Armenian, was contesting with Constantine Copronymus the crown of the West, Merwan II, once governor of Armenia and Atropatene, rewarded his Armenian contingents for help they had rendered him in his fight for the Caliphate, by enlarging the powers of the Patrician, Ashot Bagratuni, whom he made virtual Governor of Armenia, thus laying the foundations for the future Bagratide kingdom (743).

The lot of the Armenians and of their Church during this period was anything but enviable for all that. In 758 the Caliph Jafar, the Arab capital having been removed from Damascus to Bagdad,

laid heavy imposts on his subjects to meet the expenses of building the new seat of government, and Armenia suffered accordingly. Churches, convents and clergy were taxed contrary to all precedent, and church edifices were robbed of their gold and silver to the very crosses surmounting their domes. Taxation reduced the nobility to beggary. Plunder soon ran into persecution. Night vigils were prohibited in the land, and so was Christian instruction. Christians were ordered to shave their heads, to wear tall hats, and to carry leaden weights about their necks in token of their servitude. All protests from Catholicos and Patrician alike were unavailing. The people became restive. Ashot, upon commending patience, was seized as a traitor and blinded.

The Church in this period was not devoid of leaders whom favor or fear could not corrupt. The Arab Emir went so far as to presume to determine the succession in the catholicate. But the favored prelate, Zion I (767-75), declined to make himself subservient to the Moslem. A rebellion during this reign being ruthlessly suppressed (773-75), the times of Jezdegerd seemed to have returned, with the destruction of churches and monasteries, the torturing of clerics, and the slaughter of the population. At this time the exodus of the people into Byzantine territory was constant. Zion in 768 assembled a synod at Barda, on the north-east confines of Armenia, residence of the Catholicos of Albania, and there, among other acts, the Old Testament canon was fixed, including, in addition to the books commonly accepted as canonical, 2 Esdras and Baruch. The list, it is to be observed, did not include some books now accepted as canonical, viz.: Judith, Tobit, Maccabees, Wisdom of Solomon, and Sirach. Neither did it include the books of Nehemiah and Esther.

When Harun al Rashid came to the throne of the Caliphs (786), he dispatched to Armenia, with a considerable force at his back, a Governor by the name of Yezid. This man exacted hostages from all the Armenian nobility, and sought to secure the persons of three brothers of Vaspuragan by the name of Ardzruni whom he had orders to force to a profession of Islam or slay. He apprehended them at Barda, and laid before them the grim alternative of apostasy or death. They replied, "We choose neither; we will not deny Christ, and if you slay us you will but commit a great

wrong for which you will be answerable before God." The brothers were cast into prison, where the youngest of them, Merujan, at last apostatized, being presented afterward to the Caliph and from him receiving the governorship of the province of Vaspuragan. The others were beheaded, the elder of the two, last to be executed, praising God as he bent his own neck for his brother's martyr faith (786). The youngest brother did not escape a tragic fate. On his return home he was slain by David Mamigonian, so grimly were the Armenians determined to keep Armenia Christian.

This, however, called down only more persecution from the oppressor, in consequence of which 12,000 at one time left a single province for new homes in Pontus (787). In the ensuing year the Catholicos Esaias being recently deceased, the Arab tax-collector had brought before him all the gold and silver plate of the Cathedral Church of Gregory the Illuminator, at Tevin, and took from it brazenly what pleased him. By way of an anti-climax of decadence, Stephen of Tevin, a common priest, bought for himself from tax-collector and Governor the dignity of Catholicos, and was followed within two years by another of his ilk.

In 835, the Arab Governor having been recalled by the Caliph Mutasim, the Lord of Sasun, Bagarad Bagratuni, was designated upon petition of his kinsman Smbat Bagratuni and other Armenian notables, Patrician (Patric). Early during the incumbency of this prince there occurred in Persia an uprising under a leader by the name of Babak (839). It was not the first, for the Caliph Mamun once before had sent 100,000 men against the rebel, only to have them repulsed with heavy slaughter. Babak now, being in league with the Emperor Theophilus, invaded Mesopotamia. Routed, however, by an Arab force under Manuel the Armenian, Babak was forced to withdraw to the region of Taron and northward, where he proposed to make his base of future operations. The Caliph Wasik who meanwhile had come to power being advised by the Armenian Generalissimo, Smbat Bagratuni, of Babak's movements, the scene of the conflict then was shifted to the region of Ararat, where the rebel at last was routed and captured.

Bagratuni, however, with a change of Caliphs, himself soon fell

under suspicion. The new Caliph, Mutawakkil Jaafar, was a bigoted persecutor. He forbade Christians and Jews to ride on horseback, compelled them to display on their dwellings the sign of a dog or a monkey and to wear distinctive garbs, and excluded them from schools and public offices. This Caliph sent one Abu Said at the head of an army against Bagratuni. The Armenian Patric was taken by guile and sent bound with chains to Bagdad, where he escaped his tormentors by apostasy. Upon this his countrymen of Sasun rose as one man, slew Abu Said, and scattered his forces (849). Thereupon the Caliph dispatched to Armenia a heavy force commanded by the Turk, Bogha (Bull). The latter's instructions were to forward all Armenian nobles in chains to Bagdad, and to put all males of military age to the sword.

Bogha came at the head of his army to Sasun, proclaimed martial law, and having put in chains the Patric's two sons, proceeded to massacre the non-combatant population. After having thus spread consternation over the district, he proceeded to the province of Vaspuragan, whose Lord surrendered without resistance in the vain hope of saving his people the horrors of Sasun. With his wife and sons he was put in chains and made ready to be sent to Bagdad, but refusing, ere they set forth on the long journey, an offer of freedom on condition of apostasy, they were all dispatched. Bogha's men then overspread the country and butchered the inoffensive population until "the valleys were filled with the dead." The Moslems then proceeded to Nakhichevan and Tevin, from which last point for a center they sallied forth in all directions torturing, butchering and enslaving. At sight of the steadfastness of the Christians one Arab at least is reported to have cried out, "I, too, am a Christian!" and to have received with the rest the martyr's crown.

Bogha, having duly ravaged the country as far as the borders of Albania and Georgia, returned at last with captives of war to Bagdad (855). Three men of noble blood, offered the usual alternative of death or apostasy with freedom and honors, preferred death. One of these was martyred on the spot; a second, Gregory Mamigonian, last scion of an illustrious clan, escaped from prison, only to die in the homeland soon after arrival there, from his hardships, while the third, none other than Smbat

Bagratuni himself, known to history as "the Confessor," was done to death in his dungeon while at prayer.

Rise of the Bagratide Dynasty

Ashot, son of Smbat Bagratuni, became the founder of the Bagratide Dynasty which ruled in northern Armenia for over 200 years. By a stroke of statesmanship the Caliph Mutawakkil in his last days elevated Ashot to the dignity of Prince of Princes of Armenia (859), assigning thus to the Arab Emirs of Tevin a subordinate role. Ashot made his residence by turns at Ani, on the Arpachai, and at Shiragavan, at the other extremity of his domain. In 862, following Mutawakkil's assassination, the Armenian exiles at Bagdad were permitted to return to their own land and faith. The same year was marked by an abortive synod to consider the matter of a reunion with the Greeks.

Upon petition of the Armenian nobles in 885 the Caliph Mutamid sent to Ashot, now twenty-six years "Prince of Princes," along with costly gifts, a royal crown and mantle. Ashot was crowned King at Kars by the Catholicos George II. The Emperor Basil I, himself of Armenian extraction, not to be outdone by the Moslem, likewise sent Ashot a royal crown and valuable presents. Ashot established his royal residence at Pacaran, on the Akhurian River, and extended by degrees the bounds of his kingdom. He died in 890, universally loved, leaving the bulk of his private fortune to the Church for convents, hospitals and poor-houses, and the celebration of mass for the repose of his own soul.

Ashot's death was the signal for an unfortunate armed contest for the succession between the late king's brother and his eldest son. The son, Smbat, being at last established on his father's throne, received from the Caliph Mutazid a crown, with leave to subjugate the northern tribes (892). Under this warrant, in time, Smbat's dominions were pushed from Erzrum to Shamkor and Derbent. In 893 the Catholicate was removed to Neapolis (Valarshabad), to the Church of the Holy Angels, Tevin having been reduced to a mass of ruins by a great earthquake in which 70,000, for the most part Moslems, lost their lives.

In 902 the King of Kars was authorized to remit his annual tribute to the Caliph (the equivalent of a tithe of all livestock)

direct, instead of, as formerly, through the Emir of Atropatene at Tevin, to which the then incumbent, Yusuf the Persian, demurred. The opening years of the tenth century thus came to be marked by a war between Emir and King which showed not less the decadence of the Arab empire than the declining fortunes of Armenia. Yusuf put in chains the Catholicos of the time, John V, surnamed the Historian, who had sought to act the part of a mediator between the foes, and captured finally Smbat himself, kept him for an entire year in the pit of a dungeon upon a diet of bread and water, without so much as the comfort of a mat on which to recline, and constrained him to deny his faith, failing which, after the most brutal tortures, he had him beheaded, the lifeless body being exposed to the public gaze in the city of Tevin on a cross (913). In open defiance of the Caliphate, and with the object of creating a rival to the King of Kars, Yusuf conferred the royal title on the Lord of Vaspuragan, the Ardzrunian prince Gagik (nickname for Garegin?) (908). A period of bloodshed and anarchy ensued, in which Ardzrunians, Bagratides, Georgians and Persians engaged in one grand orgy of carnage, followed by all the horrors of famine. The Persian again was abroad in the land, with his old-time dilemma of "Apostasy or death!" As once, so now again the number of those who died for the faith was a great multitude. And once more the pity of it was that in the face of the common danger the Christians knew not how to hang together.

Smbat's son and successor, Ashot II, and the Catholicos John V were invited by the Armenian Regent Romanus I, Lecapenus, and Constantine Porphyrogenitus, then a youth of seventeen, to Constantinople for a conference to find a way out of Armenia's difficulties. Ashot went alone, the Catholicos declining the invitation for fear of ecclesiastical complications, and returned with a Roman army (921). The wily Yusuf now had bestowed a royal crown upon a cousin and namesake of Ashot at Tevin, thus creating a third rival for the royal dignity of Armenia. By this time, however, fortunately Ashot, King of Kings, and the Ardzrunian Gagik, of Van, by hard experience had learned to be friends. This left the two Ashots and their alien allies alone to fight it out. Designing to revolt from the Caliph, and feeling the

need of friends closer home, Yusuf now sent his former enemy, Ashot II, King of Kings, a royal crown. The Caliph Muktadir countered him by bestowing a crown on Gagik of Vaspuragan (922). The ludicrous game of kings ended with the capture of Yusuf by the Arabs, by whom he was taken in chains to Bagdad. Yusuf's successor, Nasr, recognized Ashot Bagratuni as King of Kings.

The new Arab Governor of Tevin having confiscated the Patriarchal residence in that city, the Catholicos John V sought asylum with the King of Vaspuragan (927), on the Island of Aghtamar in Lake Van, where shortly afterward he died. His successor, Stephen II, established his seat there, and there for a number of years following the Catholici maintained their residence, until Ananias I (946-68) removed the Catholicate to Argina, a village near Ani, last capital of the Kingdom of Kars. The so-called Catholicate of Aghtamar, a minor rival see continuing down to the time of the First World War, has a different origin, in a defection of the Archbishop David of Aghtamar in the year 1113, when Gregory III, a mere youth of eighteen, was elected to the highest office of the Church.

Ashot II died in 928, and, at a gathering of the Armenian nobles presided over by King Gagik of Vaspuragan his brother Abbas was elected to succeed him. Abbas fixed his capital at Kars, and cultivated friendly relations with the Emir of Tevin. Scarcely had he finished erecting the Cathedral Church of Kars, a stately structure with granite foundations which consumed five years in the building, when Ber, King of the Georgian Apghazes, appeared with an army on the north bank of the Kur (943). Abbas sent him messengers asking, "What are you here for, and what do you want of me?" "I have come," answered the haughty Ber, "to have your Cathedral dedicated according to the rites of the Georgian Church." In the fighting that ensued the King of the Apghazes was captured. Abbas brought him bound into the newly finished Cathedral. "This," said he, "is the church you proposed to dedicate; look well upon its beauty, for you never will see it again!" The captive King then was ordered taken out and blinded. His people went into mourning for him, redeemed him with his weight in silver, and entered into a covenant with

the Armenians never again to invade their country, a promise which was faithfully kept.

During this reign the Arab Emirs of Persia, Mesopotamia and Asia Minor, and, within Armenia itself, those of Tevin, Manazkert and Akhlat, were in revolt against the Caliph, while each fought the other also. To some of these petty princes Abbas paid annual tribute. It was during this period of the Arab empire's disintegration, too, that tribes of Turks from the eastern shores of the Caspian Sea began to invade and overrun Persia, adopting its religion. A detachment of these Turks, making common cause with the Kurds, invaded Armenia and Armenian Mesopotamia in the region of Merdin, where in time they absorbed a part of the Christian population.

In 961 Ashot III transferred his capital to Ani, where he was crowned by the Catholicos Ananias in the presence of forty Bishops and all the nobles. His brother Mushegh also assumed the royal title, establishing himself at Kars, where his heirs after him successively occupied his throne in subordination to the Kings of Ani. Ashot thoroughly fortified his capital and numerous other cities, built and repaired many churches, and erected convents, hospitals and poor-houses. He is known to history as Ashot the Merciful, who anticipated the ways of King Henry III of England and St. Louis of France by two and a half centuries, personally ministering in his charitable institutions to the poor and the afflicted, and entertaining at his royal table the halt, the blind and the leprous, whose feet he washed with his own hands. He kept studiously aloof from ecclesiastical controversies, and at last died empty of purse but rich in good works.

In the reign of Ashot's son and successor, Smbat II, a great wall was built around Ani (979), and a beginning made of constructing palaces and residences of a humbler type which in time grew to the number of over 100,000, a figure which in view of the patriarchal size of Armenian families would imply a population of a million or more. Ani's "thousand and one churches" passed into a proverb. These churches, in good part the work of the famous architect Tiridates, made Armenian ecclesiastical architecture, prototype of western Gothic, renowned the world over. After the severe earthquake of 989 at Constantinople, Tiri-

dates is said also to have acted as adviser in the repairing of the great dome of St. Sophia, then considered a great architectural feat.

This Smbat, ere he died, had a falling out with the clergy. In the year 988 the royal stables and granaries at Ani burned down, it is not known whether from spontaneous combustion or at the hand of an incendiary. The King was hunting the culprit, when a maniac hastening out of a church with a lighted censer in his hand was heard to say, "I go to set on fire the King's granaries!" The hasty King had the hapless man apprehended, his eyes put out, and his body covered with rushes and burned and thrown out of the city. Some monks coming to town discovered the charred remains and interred them with proper Christian rites. Whereupon the King had them exhumed and cast to the dogs. "Be it so," said the monks; "even so also shall it be with the King's own remains when he is dead!" The Queen, the monarch's own niece whom he had married in defiance of the Church, had been deceased but a few days, when the King also died (990). And then the monks' prophecy was fulfilled. For the King had not been long buried when a woman declared up and down the city streets that she had seen the late King in a dream, who also had told her that he was alive in his grave. So great was the uproar following that, to allay it, the royal remains were disinterred and placed on display.

Disintegration

In this period controversy with the Greeks revived about every twenty years. Immediately following the Apghaz war (943) many Armenians fled from Roman Armenia to the eastern half of the country to escape Greek persecution. The Greeks demanded not alone doctrinal conformity, but, what seemed even less to the taste of the Armenians, ritual as well. They rebaptized and re-ordained their Armenian converts, provoking them to retaliate in kind.

During the catholicate of Vahan I (968-69) the question of orthodoxy again came to the fore. It being discovered that Vahan had effected a *rapprochement* with the Greeks and Georgians, a synod of his bishops met at Ani was at the point of deposing him,

when he abandoned his see and fled for safety to the King of Vaspuragan. The synod elected in his place Stephen III, who made it his first act to anathematize Vahan and his royal patron, an act that Vahan heartily reciprocated. Stephen then with a large escort of his ecclesiastics journeyed to Van to bring the deposed Catholicos to reason, a course that might have been attempted before ever anathemas were exchanged. The King of Vaspuragan, Hamazasb Ardžruni, however, seized Stephen and incarcerated him in one of his castles, where after a few months he died (972). His escort were detained on the Island of Aghtamar until they consented to depart. At this time the Chalcedonist party in Armenia appears to have been not inconsiderable.

The chaotic state of the country is reflected by the numerous fragments into which it had fallen. There were three Armenian kingdoms, those, namely, of Kars, Siunik and Vaspuragan. Arab Emirs ruled at Ganjé, Tevin, Nakhichevan and Manazkert, while the Empire claimed Upper Armenia (Erzrum), Fourth Armenia (Harpūt), the western coasts of Lake Van, and Tigranocerta (Diarbekir). At this time, too, the Armenian migration toward Syria and Cilicia, gained in volume, Stephen's successor, Hatchik (973-92), appointing Bishops for Antioch and Tarsus to shepherd his people in those parts. In 992 the Catholicate was officially established at Ani.

The Empire took advantage of these conditions to drain Armenia further of its native blood. In 988 the Emperor Basil II transplanted great numbers of Armenians from Roman Armenia to Macedonia. The heretics who were but too prone to help the Moslem foe in the east, could just as well help the Empire against the Bulgars in the west. These Armenians, however, went over *en masse* to the barbarians. One among them, by name Samuel, from the Armenian canton of Terjan, rose to the royal throne of Bulgaria, and caused Basil not a little trouble. As the price of his friendship Samuel had demanded a sister of the Emperor to wife. The Greek Bishop of Sebastea (Sivas), who by affronts and persecutions had made himself obnoxious to the Armenians, by a fateful blunder was commissioned to bring to Samuel at Ochrida, his capital, a servant girl bearing the royal sister's name. The deception was detected, the Bishop burned alive, and the war

resumed. In the conflict the Greeks captured 15,000 Bulgars and Armenians, whom Basil divided into a hundred and fifty companies of a hundred each, and blinded them all except one in each company who was left the use of an eye to lead the others home. At sight of the blind host Samuel fainted, and died two days afterward (991).

CHAPTER VIII

HIGH CONTRASTS

THE iconoclastic movement in the Eastern Church of the eighth and ninth centuries was a reflex from the Saracen menace. In the eyes of the fanatical Arabs, and of certain Christians who were compelled to live with them, the veneration of images in Christian churches was a standing offence. Leo the Isaurian, and his son Constantine Copronymus, in making war upon image-worship were not more meddling in ecclesiastical affairs than patronizing a measure of political expediency. The Armenians of Roman Armenia, sometimes called Armenia Minor, were more directly involved in the iconoclastic controversy than were those in the eastern portion of the country. Here the Arab domination discouraged any such dispute, and outside the writings of John of Otzun one scarce has any intimation of the existence of such a dispute in Armenia, and John's quarrel is directly with the Paulicians as such.

Iconoclasts

The Emperor Leo the Isaurian inaugurated a persecution of all those practising or advocating the veneration of images in the churches, and upon his death bequeathed the task to his son and successor, Constantine Copronymus. A revolt ensued, headed by Artavastes, an Armenian pretender, who ultimately was defeated and slain, the iconoclastic policy being maintained throughout the reign of Leo IV.

In 780 a reversal of policies occurred when Constantine VI came to the throne of the Empire, with the Empress Dowager Irene as Regent. During this reign the seventh so-called ecumenical council, the second of Nicaea (787), gave official sanction to the veneration of images. In the year following, Constantine, who was to have married a daughter of Charlemagne, King of the Franks, was forcibly wedded by his mother to Mary, daughter of Philaretus, an Armenian nobleman, and held in virtual confinement in the Palace. The unnatural Irene proclaimed herself sole ruler and exacted from the leaders of the army a solemn promise

not to bring out her son in her lifetime to reign. But the Armenian contingents of Roman Armenia and Cappadocia refused to recognize Irene, the revolt spreading rapidly to other provinces and throughout the entire army. It now was Irene's turn to be immured in a palace, but Constantine who at the first had rewarded his Armenian troops for their loyalty by allowing them to retain the commander of their choice, soon angered them by having him seized and blinded as a possible rival to his throne. The Armenian troops revolted, winning over to their side the Paulicians of the country. Constantine sent against them the commander of his guard, the Armenian Artashir, with a considerable force. In the conflict that ensued the Emperor's armies were worsted, and the dispatching of a second military force against the rebels became necessary. This time, however, the Emperor relied more on diplomacy than on brute force, and ultimately succeeded in dividing the enemy and putting down the revolt. A thousand Armenian prisoners of war were brought to Constantinople, branded as was customary with heretics on the forehead, and banished to various places. Those of the rebels who latterly had sided with the Emperor in the hope of a reward were not more favored, and they avenged themselves by going over to the Arabs, to whom they surrendered Fort Ani (Kemakh) (792). Soon Irene prevailed on her son to immure his wife and his daughter Euphrosyne in a convent, and take to wife Irene's chambermaid, Theodora. The Empress Dowager ended up by blinding her son and once more taking over the reins of government.

In 813 Leo V, the Armenian, ascended the imperial throne of Byzantium, promising in writing that he would do nothing against either the doctrine or the worship of the Church. Leo, having defeated the Bulgars and the Saracens, put his hand to the task of restoring peace to the Church by antagonizing both image-breakers and image-worshippers equally. By this course he won for himself the sobriquets of "the Chameleon," and "the Antichrist." He was assassinated in the palace chapel during matins.

The Emperor Theophilus waged war on the Arabs and entering the Armenian province of Pasen put many of the native heretical population to the sword. Not without reverses, he pene-

trated the country as far as Lake Sevan, and returned again by way of Taron province, carrying back with him many Paulician prisoners (830). The Empress Regent Theodora, widow of Theophilus and mother of the child Emperor, Michael III, restored the images of the churches at the instigation and under the threats of her Armenian adviser Manuel, a soldier of fortune who once had been commander of the Roman forces in Anatolia, later a fugitive from the Empire and servant of the Saracens, and now was returned to his former allegiance. It was the boast of Theodora that during her regency 100,000 Paulicians were done to death.

But the Armenian Paulicians, in league with the Saracens, continued still to give the Empire trouble. In 858 the Arabs and Paulicians came as far as the coasts of Asia Minor opposite Constantinople. With Paulician assistance, Omar, Arab Governor of Melitene (Malatia), defeated the Greeks at Samosata and Amasea; but in 862 the Greeks renewing the war slew Omar in battle. Omar's standard fell to Gurshahr, Moslem Emir of Tephrike (Divrik), just northwest of Agn (Egin), not far from Kemakh, a man of Persian extraction, known to the Greeks as Chrysocheir, and mistakenly made out by Gibbon to have been himself a Christian Paulician. Again it was an Armenian Emperor, Basil I, surnamed for hailing from Adrianople "the Macedonian," who conciliated the Armenian Paulician soldier Karbeas, once dread of the Emperor Michael, pressed the war against the Moslem, and compassed the slaying of Chrysocheir (873) who once had ravaged Asia Minor from end to end. Chrysocheir had a large Armenian following.

Leaving the tenets, practices and later history of the Armenian Paulicians for subsequent discussion, we now proceed to consider the art and architecture of the time.

Artists

It was not all war in those days, and Christians had other things to do for the faith besides fighting and dying for it.

King Gagik turned the Island of Aghtamar in Lake Van into a fortified city, a place of refuge from invading barbarians. Around about the island he sank great rocks brought from a distance, and

invested it with strong walls. Within the fortifications was a considerable city, with an abundant water supply, and streets made resplendent with monuments of gold. On the summit of the height in the city's center was the Cathedral, work of the architect Manuel. The edifice, still standing in a fair state of preservation, was, like the New Jerusalem, a perfect cube, the length, the breadth and the height thereof being equal, forty yards each way. The walls were three paces in thickness, and there were no columns. About 1,700 tons of iron went into the construction of the building, and the domes were overlaid with gold. The high altar was ornamented with gold and precious stones and pearls, and silver doors opened upon it. A royal gallery afforded the King the luxury of privacy in worship when desired. The exterior decorations of the sanctuary were significant. There were paintings and carvings of the first creation, or the Natural Man. Boars, and bulls, and bears, and lions form the groundwork for the representation of the King enthroned in the midst of dancing girls, minstrels, wrestlers and fighting men with drawn swords. This series was climaxed by the Fall, Adam and Eve eating of the forbidden fruit. A second series, the interior decorations, depicted by contrast the new creation, or the Spiritual Man. In it are figures of Abraham and David and the Old Testament Prophets, up through the Apostles and Evangelists, to Christ. On the west façade of the building the King is represented standing, in the act of offering the Church to the Savior. Not, says the contemporary chronicler, in any attitude of haughty pride, but, as it were, humbly bringing the Pot of Manna, or the Box of Exceeding Precious Ointment ("of Thine own to Thee"), and imploring the forgiveness of his sins. The sculptures to this day remain mostly intact, though time and vandal hands have effaced the paintings. The approximate date of the Cathedral of the Holy Cross of Aghtamar is 925-30 A.D.

The Cathedral of Aghtamar is but one sample of that mediaeval Armenian church architecture which dotted the land with beautiful sanctuaries, beautiful still in their ruins. Reference has already been made to the churches of Ani, of especial interest to students of mediaeval Christian architecture. Of decorative art, the Monastery of Datev, in the province of Siunik, afforded a notable in-

stance. The Cathedral Church of the Monastery, erected or rebuilt in 895, was decorated under Jacob, abbot of the Monastery and Bishop of the Diocese, in 930 A.D., at the hands of Frankish artists. There were portraits of patriarchs, prophets, apostles and Christ, which would be today priceless relics of budding European painting, had Moslem vandalism spared them beyond the hundred years or so of their actual life. The coincidence in dates makes us only wonder whether the same artists did not paint the pictures of the Church of the Holy Cross of Aghtamar.

Turks

The year 1021 was a fateful one. In that year Toghrul the Turk invaded Nakhichevan and Tevin, and raided the region around about Etchmiadzin, plundering the country, burning churches, massacring the population, and carrying off captives. Vasak Bahlavuni, father of Gregory Magistros, gave battle to Toghrul's Turks, and slew their champion Seven-Wolves, but was himself killed while in the act of prayer by a prowling Turk with a stone. It is a sign of the poor intelligence service and general unpreparedness of the country that this Vasak set forth to meet the invaders with but 500 men, not even waiting to muster the 5,000 immediately available, and was taken aback by sight of the enemy's hordes. The Armenians of Vaspuragan met the invader in a bloody battle. The Turks are described as wearing their hair long and loose, and fighting on horseback with bows of enormous size which they used effectively at long range. The Armenians, with their broadswords, were at a disadvantage. For the time being the enemy was repulsed, but the hordes of the invaders, fierce fighters, seemingly were inexhaustible.

The Seljukian invasions caught the Armenian military power at its nadir. Armenian princes from now on one by one abandon their patrimonial estates to seek an uncertain asylum within the bounds of the Empire. The Seljukian irruption of 1021 broke the spirit of Senekerim (Sennacherib) of Vaspuragan, last of the royal line of Gagik. Having convinced himself by a study of biblical and patristic prophecy that the kingdom of those parts was nigh an end, he called together his family and nobles and proposed to them the surrender of his territories to the Emperor

Basil II in exchange for Sebastea and the surrounding country. Three hundred mules carried the presents accompanying the King's letter to the Emperor proposing the barter. Basil accepted the offer, and Senekerim, in return for eight cities of Vaspuragan, over four thousand smaller towns and villages, with two-thirds of their resident population, twelve fortresses, and 115 monasteries with their glebes, received Sebastea and its territories as far as the Euphrates. He went west (1021) taking with him a third of his subjects, about 400,000 souls, including nobles, clergy, soldiery and populace. Monks from the Convent of Nareg bore away with them the bones of the sainted Gregory, of Prayer-Book fame, eighteen years previously deceased. Within the Empire's domains the immigrants built the cities of Agn and Arabgir.

John, King of Ani, overawed by the presence of the Emperor Basil with an imposing army at his back, in that same year pledged to him and his successors, after his own demise, his capital and lands. Under John's successor, though not without a stubborn contest in which treachery on both sides played its sinister part, the northern Armenians surrendered Ani with its territories to the Empire (1046). It was about this time, too, that Gregory Magistros, son of Vasak Bahlavuni, exchanged his patrimonial estates to the northward of Etchmiadzin for lands in the south, with the title of Duke of Vaspuragan, Taron and Mesopotamia (1051).

Toghrul returned to Persia to set up a kingdom, and sealed with the Caliph Kaim a treaty of amity. In three successive years, from 1047 to 1049, he overran Armenia with his Turks and Persians, penetrating the country as far as the Canton of Pasen. In the third year he attacked the city of Arzn, a flourishing town of 300,000 inhabitants, with 800 churches, south-east of Theodosiopolis (Garin), which afterward seems to have inherited the other's name (Erzrum). The citizens dwelt in a false security, for the city had neither walls nor other fortifications, when suddenly destruction overwhelmed them, one-half of the city's population, including 150 priests, being slaughtered in cold blood. In 1050 Kars was sacked, the Turks carrying off along with heavy booty a multitude of slaves. The roads were strewn with the bodies of young children whom the Moslems knocked out of their

mothers' arms while driving the latter into captivity. In the annals of those times the defence of Manazkert alone stands out as a notable exploit. Fortified by a threefold wall, the city held out successfully against the enemy (1054). Distinguished among its gallant defenders are named an Armenian priest and a French soldier. In 1060 the invaders penetrated the Empire as far as Sebastea, and burned that city with its hundred beautiful churches.

Toghrul died in 1062, and was succeeded by Alp Arslan, who kept up the annual raids into Armenia, and in 1065 received the dastardly surrender of Ani. The city was sacked, Alp Arslan bathed in the blood of a thousand men slaughtered for the purpose, and the huge silver cross surmounting the dome of the Cathedral Church was removed to Nakhichevan to be used as a door-sill in the main entrance of the great mosque there. The Empire's disasters were climaxed by the battle of Manazkert (1071), in which the Emperor Romanus Diogenes was captured.

In the same year the Armenian Catholicate was removed from Zamanta, in Pontus, to the Amanus. Gagik, King of Kars, in 1064 had exchanged his title and domains for a princedom in Pontus with a hundred towns and villages, and in that province, in the town of Zamanta, a fortified city between Amasea on the one side, and Comana and Larissa on the other, the Catholicate had found a temporary refuge, Vahram, son of Gregory Magistros, being elected and installed as chief primate under the name of Gregory II. Now the Turkish domination made a more southerly location imperative.

It was ever the one fatal blunder in the policy of the Byzantine, as in more recent times of the Russian, Empire, that Armenians were sent out to fight in other lands, while their own, most important of frontiers, was left comparatively undefended. Had the Armenian people been strengthened on their own soil and helped to fight the Empire's battles along their own borders, history might have a different result to record. The failure of the Empire properly to fortify its Armenian borderlands may in part be explained by the geography of the country, easy of access to an invader from the east, and difficult of defence by virtue of lofty ranges and deep valleys rendering concerted action improbable if not impossible. A house, as it were, at the cross-roads, with a door

opening on each avenue by which its occupants may scatter in three several directions whilst an enemy is forcing an entrance at the fourth. This in turn accounts for the divided state of the Armenian people themselves, and the mutual jealousies of their royalty and aristocracy which make Armenian history so similar to that of Poland in more recent times. But above all, the religious antipathies between Greeks and Armenians played ever their fatal part.

Saints

Those were times when monasticism naturally flourished. Men fled the world which seemed to treat them so ill, and sought their solace in the comforts of religious meditation and prayer.

The origin of the monastic movement was contemporaneous with the entry of Catholic Christianity into Armenia. Anchoretism of the type of the early fourth century came in with the Illuminator himself, who retired especially in his last years into solitude. Later in that century Eustathius, Bishop of Sebastea (357-80), created cenobitic monachism, that form of monasticism which Basil the Great, Bishop of Cesarea in Cappadocia (330-79), promoted with such distinction. Nerses the Great, contemporary of Basil, introduced it into Armenia. Since then Eastern monasticism has remained essentially unaltered. What Fortescue says of the Greek monastery is substantially true of the Armenian: "An orthodox monastery is the most perfect relic of the fourth century left in the world."¹³ The rules of Armenian monasteries are simple and few, viz.: long vigils, one meal a day, and poverty.

Even down to our own day monachism has been strong in the Church. Zarbanelian in his *History of Armenian Literature* lists some 250 monasteries that at different times have flourished in the land from the Caspian to the Mediterranean.¹⁴ In the eighteenth century in the province of Erivan alone there were twenty-one monasteries, and in the following Ormanian on a tour of inspection in the regions of Van and Mush found a half dozen in a flourishing condition. The multiplying of lay schools in modern times has deprived them of much of their *raison d'être*.

The tenth century was preeminently the monastic period of Armenian Christianity, marked by unusual building activity.

In that century the persecution of Monophysites within the Empire by Romanus Lecapenus (919-45), caused many of their monks to seek refuge in Armenia. Twenty-five years before Mount Athos commenced to be a center of monachism in the Balkans, the Convent of Nareg was founded on the south shores of Lake Van (935). The Convent was reputed for the learning of its inmates, notably Ananias, who wrote an important work, now lost, against the Paulicians, and his grand-nephew, Gregory, author of a Prayer-Book that to this day is the standard devotional book of the Armenians.

Two notable Armenian monastics of this time found their way to the West. (1) *Macarius*, "the Armenian," born at Antioch in the year 970. High-born, he was educated in his native Armenian, in Greek and in Syriac. As Bishop of Antioch he ever was a friend of the afflicted and the poor who at all seasons crowded to his episcopal mansion. Shy of fame, however, he forsook Antioch, and in the company of four others of his nationality visited the holy places, carrying in his hand a crozier with which he was reputed to perform many miracles of healing. Imprisoned and tortured by the Moslems at Jerusalem, he turned upon his release westward. Passing through Bavaria and Mainz, in 1011 he arrived at Ghent, stopping at the Monastery of St. Bavon, patron saint of the city, where, during a plague in the year following, he died ministering to the sick. Many resorted to his grave for healing, and his relics were scattered throughout Europe. He was canonized by the Pope, and an order of monastics named for him. A Latin writer quoted by Chamchean pronounces him a worthy son of Armenia, "a land from of old the Mother of a host of brave noblemen, strong champion of the faith and the truth, and of all heroic virtues." (2) *Simeon*, son of a military officer of Armenia Major, born about 956. He fled from his own forced nuptials to a monastery, where, abstaining from bread and all animal foods, he subsisted on roots and wild fruits, and drank even water sparingly. He performed miracles of healing, and even was reputed to have raised a disciple from the dead. He, too, visited the holy places, and was entertained at Jerusalem by the then Armenian Bishop, Arsenius, and, in the hope, finally, of escaping the vain honors of this world, took ship for Rome. Con-

trary to some accusations of heresy, he was received by the Pope, and pronounced a true Catholic. Proceeding then along the coasts of Tuscany where the kindnesses of the hospitable outweighed the jeers of the impudent, he arrived at Pisa, and then at Lugano, whence he proceeded over the Bardoney Pass and the Pyrenees to Santiago de Compostella. Sailing thence to Britain, afterward he returned by way of Gaul to Italy, where he took up his residence at Mantua, in a convent of the order of St. Benedict, known as the Padulirian. A contemporary admirer belonging to the order says of him, "He was a true worshipper of God, a lover of peace, a lover of the brethren; in speech silent, to the poor merciful and kind, a worthy husbandman of the Lord's vineyard, gentle in his bearing, sweet in his conversation, firm in the faith, instant in prayer, unremitting in his fasts, unwearied in his vigils." He died in 1016, and was buried in the same monastery, where his hair-cloth garment, Psalter and Testament, in Armenian, are said to be to this day preserved.

Nor are we to suppose that monks alone had in that age a name for sanctity. In times when so much superstition passed for piety, there were not lacking among the laity good souls who were rich in good works, and exemplified the gospel by their lives. Gregory Magistros' tribute to his own grandparents will bear citing:

They were living witnesses of the Word of God, children of martyrs, perfect in their practical benefactions, in clean living and pure wedlock, in the daily singing of psalms, and in the love of the poor, and in hospitality. Their manner of life was a model for all Armenians. They seemed to have no other interest than to redeem captives, to free prisoners, to feed the hungry, to give drink to the thirsty, to teach youth, to sustain orphans, to afford a home to the widow, to snatch away those captured by the strong, to feed with their own hands the indigent and the monastic, to marry orphans mated by a pure and Christian faith. Who ever died that they were not there to bury the dead and console the living? Who ever came to them in debt, that they did not pay his obligation for him? or sad, that he ever left the shelter of their roof uncomforted? Who ever sickened, that they did not visit him, or was

impoverished that they did not gather for him that which was scattered? And besides all this, with their fasting and prayer they showed themselves more devout than any monastics, in courage undaunted, in meekness past understanding, in beauty of spirit matchless!

CHAPTER IX

THE PAULICIANS

THE roots of the Christological controversies of the Church go back to the Apostolic Age. When we read in Paul's writings of the activities of the Judaizers, perhaps it scarcely occurs to us to inquire into the real point at issue between him and them. That the Judaizers insisted on the Mosaic Law and ceremonial as being necessary to salvation, while Paul maintained the sufficiency of Christian faith, is as far as the casual reader goes in penetrating the character of the controversy. The difference, however, lies deeper than that. Properly the Judaizers were Unitarians who would have accorded to Jesus Christ a place of prophetic authority only. In their view Jesus was not more than another inspired teacher in Israel, supplementing indeed and perfecting the Mosaic Law, but in no way abrogating it. Even to-day the Jew is kindly disposed toward Christ, if we will but let him accept Him as a prophet, even as the greatest, in Israel. But Jewish Unitarianism never has taken kindly to the Apostle of the Gentiles; for Paul's Christology makes Jesus out to be something "more than a prophet."

To Paul's mind salvation was not a matter of specific acts, such as the Mosaic Law prescribed, but of personal relationships with God. And to him Christ was that personal downreaching of God to men through whom men could believe in God himself and be saved. In other words, Christ was the saving God in human flesh (cf. Acts 11:19-26 and 16:31, 34). Faith in Christ therefore more than fulfills the Mosaic Law understood as an ethical and ceremonial system. It sets a man personally right with God, superseding and making superfluous the Mosaic Law. This, in truth, is Trinitarianism, not, to be sure, thoroughly elaborated, but none the less clearly implied, in the New Testament. In taking this position, Paul believed that he was giving the Old Testament teaching itself the only true interpretation. The Jewish mind, on the other hand, always imbued with a crass Unitarianism, never took kindly to it. That was the ultimate undoing of the Church in Palestine. A Church that must needs serve as but a side-chapel

to the Temple, and a Christ who is no more than a prophet, cannot survive. If they did survive, it was only in the Ebionite, Monarchian and Arian teaching of the first Christian centuries, or, in a still more corrupt form, in Islam, which is Unitarianism gone mad.

The Adoptionist form of the Monarchian or Unitarian view of the person of Christ made its appearance so early as the end of the second century. It exercised the mind of the early Church over a wide area in the West, covering North Africa, Spain, Gaul and Italy. In the East the great center of Adoptionist teaching was the see of Antioch, whose Bishop, Paul of Samosata (260-72) advocated it in the third century. On this view, our Lord was not Deity Incarnate, but the Son of Mary, whom God "adopted" for his own at the Baptism, when a voice from heaven declared, "That is my Beloved Son." Nestorianism was the old Antiochean Adoptionism under a new name. It, too, came from Antioch, where Nestorius, a native of Germanicia (Marash), once was Bishop. It stressed the human personality of Christ, and viewed the deity as but an accident of the humanity, for which reason it was condemned by the Third Ecumenical Council (Ephesus, 431). As Armenia received much of its early Christianity from Antioch, it is not surprising that Antiochean Adoptionism, named from Paul of Samosata Paulianism, and among the Armenians, Paulicianism, should have gained an early entrance there.

Manichaeism

As Paulicianism frequently has been confused with Manichaeism, it becomes here advisable briefly to examine into the history and peculiar tenets of the latter sect.

Not to enter into the fantastic speculations and eschatology of Mani, his main positions were the following. In the beginning there were two principles, Light or Spirit, and Darkness or Matter, both uncreated and of equal power, the one good and the other evil. The powers of evil, through envy, sought to destroy the good, and God, to defend his own domain, created the Mother of Life, who brought forth the First Man, Jesus. The latter waged war against the kingdom of darkness, but was overcome, whereupon God sent the Spirit of Life to his rescue. The weapons of

the Spirit of Life, however, were captured by the Prince of Darkness, wherefore God sent the Virgin of Light and the Holy Spirit into the contest. This so far had a favorable outcome that the Spirit of Light was able to create the world, and Adam after the likeness of the First Man. Thus Adam, or the Human Race, comes to be made up of a spirit stolen from the kingdom of light, and a material body derived from the kingdom of darkness, having within him two souls the one contrary to the other. The body is evil, and marriage, except in the case of "the elect," to be discountenanced. The Old Testament is the work entirely of the evil principle, while the New is in part only of divine origin, and largely the invention of later centuries.

While there was no sort of identity between the two sects, one discerns a few points of contact:

1. Neither of them paid reverence to the Cross, or to the Virgin Mother, though for this similarity of attitudes there was a divergence of reasons.

2. Alike in the Manichæan and in the Paulician Christology, Christ is not Creator, but creature. Once satisfied of this fact, it appears that orthodox writers usually classed the two together, and took no pains to inquire further.

3. The Paulicians sometimes posed as Phantasiasts, a sect likewise having a certain kinship with Manichæans in that they taught the Incarnation and the Passion of Christ alike to have been in appearance only, and not in reality.

4. A certain secrecy was observed in the worship of both sects, owing to the fact that they both were persecuted, this even involving the aspersion that at their convocations they committed all sorts of excesses.¹⁵

5. The origin of both sects was almost synchronous, both Mani and Paul of Samosata making their appearance in the third quarter of the third century.

But the following circumstances will show that such details aside, there was nothing in common between the two sects:

1. Armenian writers rarely accuse the Paulicians of Manichæan leanings; on the contrary, the followers of Constantine of Mananali, seventh century Paulician leader, were actually required to

anathematize Manichaeism along with all other heresies, including, it is to be assumed, the prevailing orthodoxy.

2. Paulicianism was not, like Manichaeism, a speculative faith, and paid scant attention to the dualistic problem. Neither did it discredit the Old Testament, belittle the New, or dabble in extra-biblical teachings.

3. The Manichaeans held the Spirit of Christ and the Cosmic Light to be identical, worshipping both in Fire and Sun; the Paulicians were not idolaters, but, as they claimed, primitive Christian believers. The former taught the transmigration of spirits; the eschatology of the latter was biblical.

4. The Manichaeans rejected baptism, and likewise the communion except for the "twelve elect" who observed it without wine; the Paulicians observed both sacraments in their primitive simplicity, the malign accusations of their enemies notwithstanding.

5. The Manichaean hierarchy was a different thing from the Paulician ministry. There was a successor to Mani, and with him Twelve Elect, representing the Apostles. These in turn ordained Seventy-Two Bishops, who consecrated priests, deacons and preachers. Such a hierarchy, as we shall see, was completely alien to the spirit of the Paulician ministry.

To make the distinction complete, each one of these two sects had its own independent history.

According to the Eastern sources, Mani was a Persian of priestly family, brought up from his infancy in the Mazdaean faith, and adopting in his youth the Christian, at one time actually becoming pastor of a Christian congregation, though this last circumstance is seriously questioned. Dissatisfied alike with Mazdaeism and Christianity, he attempted to blend them into one system, representing himself as a religious reformer. In 270 A.D. he won the friendship of the Persian monarch, Sapor I, but fled to India and China, being accused by the Magi of heresy. Concealed for a while in caves of Turkestan, he wrote his book, *Erdengi-Mani*, which he claimed himself to have brought down from heaven. In the end, engaging in a public debate with the Magi, he was pronounced unorthodox, crucified and flayed (277). In the West there seems to have been a fascination in the very

eclecticism of Mani's heresy, in a somewhat Christianized form, for such a man even as Augustine. From Persia, the sect spread rapidly through Syria and Palestine, to Egypt and North Africa, Italy, Gaul and Spain.

Unlike Manichaeism, Monarchianism (Unitarianism) had its rise within the Empire. The Paulians, or Adoptionists, were condemned at the first Ecumenical Council (Nicaea, 325). According to Epiphanius, the Pepuzians and the Alogians, who overspread Phrygia and Cappadocia, were sectaries of the same hue, while the Armenian Paulicians of later centuries were lineal descendants of the earlier Paulians. "Behold your Paulicians," exclaims Gregory Magistros in the eleventh century, "who got their poison from Paul of Samosata!" The same origin is attributed to the Paulicians by Petrus Siculus in the ninth century. With Nestorians and other heretics, the Paulicians were driven by the persecuting Emperors of Constantinople into Syria and Arabia, where they influenced Moslem thought.

The Paulicians through the Middle Ages

The resurgence of Paulicianism synchronizes with the rise of Islam in the seventh century. There was a revival of it in Armenia during the incumbency of the Catholicos Nerses III, the Builder (641-61). The headquarters of the sect was in Jrga canton, north of the modern Bitlis, where Zarehavan, a town figuring in later Paulician history, also was situated. At that time the controversies of the orthodox Armenians with the Chalcedonists seem materially to have helped the cause of the dissenters. About the year 645 at the head of the anti-Chalcedonists of Armenia was John Mairacomensis, who, with a disciple, perhaps an own brother, by name Sergius, occupying the episcopal see of Edessa (Urfa), through translations of Julian of Halicarnassus, and by original writings, lent undesigned aid to the Alogi, Cathari, Phantasiasts and Paulicians of his day.

In 654 there died at Damascus a Paulician leader by the name of Theodore Rushduni. Soon thereafter the aforementioned Sergius joined himself to the sect, proving himself their ablest and most zealous champion. He seems the same as the one mentioned by Photius and by Petrus Siculus. In 667 the Paulicians,

under the guise of Phantasiasts, took the part of the Armenian Synod of Manazkert as against the Catholic Chalcedonists. Facts, these, showing how far at that time the Armenian Church was under the influence of Paulicianism.

According to Petrus Siculus, who was sent by the Emperor Basil I in 868 to Tephrike (Divrik) to arrange an exchange of prisoners of war with Chrysocheir, there flourished about the same time in Armenia, in the canton of Mananali, near the modern Erzurum, a great Paulician leader, Constantine, who called himself Sylvanus, and claimed to have derived his teachings from the Apostle Paul (653). For the space of some twenty-seven years this man was the recognized head of the sect, and was the author of a doctrinal work, now lost. He was martyred in 684 by an agent of the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, by name Simeon, who in turn was converted to the tenets of the sect, and in turn (690), under Justinian II, paid for his convictions with his life. One hardly could in those days be a Paulician leader and die in his bed.

About 717 the Paulicians of southern Armenia had the ear of the Saracen Governor Walid. Their headquarters was at Martyropolis, the Arab Mufarkin, now Farkin, near Diarbekir, a town centrally located, and rendez-vous for all sorts of persecuted sects from the north and west. In these circumstances and at such a place is said to have originated the iconoclastic movement in the Roman Empire. By a certain irony this region was about the most destitute of the whole Armenian dispersion, a home-mission field of the Armenian Evangelical churches, in the nineteenth century.

The orthodox Armenian Church was not caught napping. In the third year of the reign of the Catholicos John of Otzun a Synod met at Tevin (719), the last or 32nd of whose deliverances relates to the Paulicians and reads as follows:

It is not permitted for anyone to stop at any of the places of the polluted evil sectaries called Paulicians, or to approach them for conversation, or to exchange visits with them, but one must keep away from them entirely, despise and hate them, for the children of the Devil and kindlers of the eternal fire that they are, alienated from the love of the Creator's will;

and if perchance anyone shall join himself to them or come into relations of love and amity with them, it will be necessary to punish such and to place him under heavy penalties until he shall return to reason and regain his soundness of faith; and if such an one be found in the same path a second time, we order that he be entirely cut off and cast out as a plague from among the members of the Church of Christ, lest a root of bitterness springing up cause them to suffer, and many be polluted thereby.

Gegnesius, a successor (717-41) of Constantine's in the presidency of the Paulician Church, in the first half of the eighth century was summoned by the Patriarch Germanus to Constantinople and put through a verbal questioning. Why had he forsaken the orthodox Church? and why did he not render homage to the Virgin Mother of God? Gegnesius replied that he never had left the orthodox Church, and that he did pay homage to the Virgin Mother. By this latter term, however, Gegnesius meant the Heavenly Jerusalem, and by the former the Paulician Church. The Paulicians never answered their enemies without subterfuge. However, the iconoclastic Emperor, Leo the Isaurian, felt attracted to Gegnesius. In the next century, too, Nicephorus I (802-11), contemporary of Charlemagne, also befriended the Paulicians, and encouraged them with other heretics to settle in the district of Melitene.

Leo V, the Armenian (813-20), set up a court of inquiry under the Bishop and the Civil Governor of Neo-Cesarea, the modern Niksar, north-east of Tocat, to examine into the Paulician situation in eastern Asia Minor. The Paulicians assassinated those conducting the inquest and fled to Melitene, now under a Saracen Governor, who received them kindly, and assigned to them a small town, Argæum, in which to live. For years from this place the Paulicians made raids across the border into the Empire.

The Empress Regent, Theodora, in 835 instituted a thoroughgoing persecution of these sectaries throughout Asia Minor. It was her proud boast that she had destroyed 100,000 of them. Karbeas (Garbees, short for Garabed), an Armenian army officer whose aged father had lost his life in this persecution, vowing to avenge his parent's death, at the head of an armed troop of

Paulicians fled to Argæum, assaulted and captured the fortresses of Amara and Tephrike, and carried thence the war into Asia Minor. His father-in-law, the Moslem Chrysocheir, captured Ephesus, and desecrated the Church of St. John the Divine by turning it into a stable. But the tide of fortune soon turned. Karbeas was conciliated by the Armenian Emperor Basil, Chrysocheir slain in battle, Tephrike recaptured (873), and the back of the Paulician resistance broken forever.

In such times as these the Paulician leader, Smbat of Zarehavan, made his appearance (840). He set up his headquarters at Tonrak, a town of the district of Manazkert, whence Armenian Paulicians come also to be known as Tonrakians. The place is in the same general region with other towns figuring from time to time in Paulician history, such as Jrga (Zurich), Tulail, Khnus, Jwurm (Tchévirmé), and Zarehavan. Of Smbat's personal history time has preserved but little. He is reported to have been a man of ascetic habits, calling himself a "bishop," and denying the validity of the orthodox sacraments. While his enemies called him anti-christ, he spoke of himself as "light," "life," and "truth," by which doubtless he meant he shared with Christ a God-given mission. In keeping with the practice of his sect, in self-defence, he dissimulated his beliefs, and like many others of his standing he died a martyr's death. He was executed by order of the Arab Emir of those parts as a self-confessed Christ whose resurrection he might, if he would, re-enact in self-justification, not within three days, but within thirty. Gregory Magistros names Smbat's successors in office down to his own day, viz.: Theodorus, Ananias, Arca (King), Sergius, Cyril, Joshua (contemporary of the Catholicos Sergius I), and Lazar. Those must have been distinguished men to have had in such times even so much as their names preserved.

About the year 1002 the Tonrakians won over to their side the Bishop of Harck, a diocese to the south-east of the modern Erzurum, in whose center lay the towns of Khnus and Jwurm, two places noted in more recent Paulician history. Without severing his connection with the established Church, this Bishop, Jacob, proceeded to govern his diocese by the rules of the Tonrakians, forbidding unworthy priests to say mass, abolishing auricular confessions,

and discontinuing all liturgical services in the behalf of the dead. He is said to have lived an ascetic life, fasting often, wearing sackcloth, and going about barefoot, and being a man of eloquent speech to have won the enthusiastic support of many in his diocese. Writes the historian of the time: "Men who once had been haughty in their pride of authority now went so far in surrendering themselves to his obedience, that even had he commanded them to give up their lives for him, they would not have demurred, or so much as dared open their mouths or make a cry."

Before long, however, Jacob's reforms invited the opposition of the monks, and caused a split in his churches. As he had the support of the nobles of his diocese, two several sessions of a synod there assembled failed to bring him to an accounting, but eventually a pious monk of Garin province, by the name of Isaiah, compassed his downfall. This man, having gained his confidence and acquainted himself thoroughly of his doctrines, reported him to the Catholicos Sergius, who with fair words summoned him, stripped him of his orders, branded him on the forehead with the fox-brand, sign of heretical ecclesiastics, and by way of preliminary to casting him into a dungeon ordered him led about preceded by a public crier, saying, "Whosoever slips away from the Holy Faith of St. Gregory, to enter and join himself to the fold of the lawless Tonrakians, wild beasts of human visage, shall suffer this same penalty of justice!"

From prison Jacob fled by night into the territory of the Empire, and proceeded to Constantinople, where he sought baptism into the Greek faith. Refused, he returned to his own country, and for a while hid among fellow-sectaries at Tonrak, and later on the west shores of Lake Van, among mountain farms and villages around about the town of Akhlat, then under Arab rule. We are told he ended his days at Mufarkin, where a motley population of Nestorians, Jacobites, Manichaeans and other sectaries enjoyed the protection of the Arab provincial Emir.

Only two years after the aforementioned Synod of Harck, Tonrakianism assumed virulent form at Shirni, in the ancient Paulician district of Mananali. A monk, Gundzik by name, converted to his heretical views a lady of rank, Hranush; who in her turn won to the faith two sisters, together with their brother Vrverr,

a prince whose previous piety and loyalty to the Church had been above reproach, and who once had founded at his own costs and on his own estate an orthodox monastery. This Vrrerr turned now into a veritable "enemy of God and of his saints," thus encouraging his peasant tenants also to turn into enthusiastic iconoclasts, smashing crosses in public places and otherwise inviting upon themselves the avenging wrath of the authorities. The Emperor Basil II in the year 1005 sent out to those parts a Justice to deal with the situation. The sectaries were chastised and their dwellings wrecked, but Vrrerr himself escaped injury through the protecting influence of a brother of high rank.

Deportation was a favorite method of the Emperors in dealing with these heretics. The process of the transference of the Paulicians to the Balkan peninsula is recorded in its broad outlines. Multitudes of Paulicians in 752 were transplanted by Constantine V from Germanicia, Melitene, and Theodosiopolis to Thrace to defend the Empire against the Slavs and Bulgars. In 969 the Armenian Emperor, John Zimisce, upon suggestion of Theodore, Patriarch of Antioch, deported more Paulicians to Philippopolis and Thrace. Basil II in 988 sent a great number of Armenians from Roman Armenia to the same region; many of them must have been Paulicians. The deportations helped stir up missionary zeal from the beginning. So early as 868 according to Petrus Siculus the Paulicians were sending missionaries to Bulgaria, laying the foundations of the Bogomile Church which played so important a part in the dissemination of dissenting views in pre-Reformation Europe. Numbers of these sectaries, of whom remnants are to be found in the Balkans to this day, were met with in 1189 by the crusading Emperor Frederick Barbarossa.

These deportations by no means completely dried up Paulicianism at its sources. Many of the sect were found by the Crusaders in Syria and Palestine. In Armenia itself, in 945, the Tonrakians were so numerous that they drew the attention of the Abbot Ananias of Nareg, who wrote an important treatise against them. At this time the sect enjoyed the active support of the nobles and many of the clergy, and was widely spread over northern Taron and Armenian Mesopotamia, the two regions keeping in touch with each other by means open and secret. But the tenth century

was a time also of suspicions and horrors. For with the decline of the Arab power and the return of Byzantine domination the zeal of the persecutor was once more inflamed, and often a charge of Paulicianism was sufficient to bring severe punishment alike upon the guilty and the innocent.

Once again, about the middle of the eleventh century, the sectaries appear in their ancient haunts. Gregory Magistros, soldier, churchman and writer, about 1050 sent out by the Emperor Constantine Monomachus as Duke of the East, wrote to the Assyrian Patriarch and the Armenian Catholicos letters of warning about the Tonrakians, while he himself tightened the net around the heretics. Another synod was called at Harck in 1051, over a thousand of the sectaries were baptized into the Church, and their meeting-place torn down to make room for a church dedicated to St. George. In his persecution of the sect the Duke sees himself in a humane and generous light. "We commanded their dwellings to be destroyed from the foundations and burned with fire, and themselves we expelled from our parts; but with corporal penalties we penalized no one, though the law provides for them the extreme penalty, under which law before our time many generals and princes delivered them up to the sword and unpityingly spared neither aged nor infant in arms, as also was quite meet." Truly that was a sinister role that was in those days played by a defender of the faith. And there for the time being we may leave the fortunes of the sect, henceforth a submerged and all but forgotten minority.

Paulician Doctrine and Practice

A certain secretiveness was observed by these heretics in all ages down to our own times. They had exoteric doctrines that they divulged to the uninitiated, and esoteric teachings that were reserved for the inner circle of believers. One observes this secretiveness even in the times of their boldest operations. Their very nomenclature subserved that end. At the middle of the seventh century, the Armenian district of Mananali, near Garin, was *Achaia*; Cibossa, in Pontus, was *Macedonia*; Argæum, near Melitene, was *Colossæ*, and Mopsuestia (Mesis), in Cilicia, *Ephesus*. These cryptic Pauline designations, the like of which were

also given to individual workers, were prompted, not alone by a desire to lend the sect the sanction of a great Apostle's name, but also to protect it.

So far as we may glean them from the orthodox Armenian writers, the doctrines and practices of the Paulicians were as follows: They maintained that Mary bore other children after Jesus, and therefore was not perpetually a virgin; they rejected the intercession of the saints, and the common reverence paid to them; they condemned the veneration of the Cross, which they said was nothing but wood, falsely attributed miraculous powers; they denounced the hierarchy of the Church as unscriptural, and called their own ministry "teachers," insisting on their parity, and allowing none but *notarii* or copyists of the scriptures for acolytes; they reprobated the worship and ordinances of the orthodox Church, regarding only the spiritual intent of the two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper, and so minimizing the value of the elements therein employed, and calling the buildings in which they themselves assembled for worship not churches, but prayer-houses.

Gregory of Nareg, at the opening of the eleventh century, in a letter now extant (for the full text see Appendix I), enumerates against the Paulician Smbat and his followers fourteen points, accusing them of denying ordination, the communion, baptismal regeneration, the sacrament of baptism itself, the holy chrism, genuflexions in prayer and the Lord's Day, and of practising immoral excesses, of discarding marriage (the Paulicians denied that it was a sacrament), of making light of the Cross and ignoring the Atonement, of calling the head of their church "Christ," and countenancing man-worship, of ridiculing the ceremonies of first-fruits, and putting their trust in riches!

Later in the same century Gregory Magistros says of them: "They have no fasts, and no distinctions between men and women, or families, neither have they respect for anything, divine or created, but they ridicule everything including the New Law. And when they are questioned point blank, they curse and swear with all their might, repudiating all charges, for we are not ignorant of their deceit." Like John of Otzun before him, and

Nerses the Graceful after him, he also confuses them with Manichaeans and sun-worshippers.¹⁶

It is a far cry from the eleventh to the nineteenth century, but Paulicianism had to wait until a more enlightened age to be afforded the opportunity to speak for itself. At an inquest, we mean, by the Synod of Etchmiadzin, extending over a term of years (1837-45), into the tenets and usages of certain Tonrakians who had joined the great Armenian exodus from Erzurum province and the district of Khnus, at the close of the Russo-Turkish War of 1828-29, and were then living in the towns of Arkhveli and Gumri (Alexandropol, now Leninakan) in Russian Armenia, which inquest elicited several written confessions.

One of these documents in substance declares: We must keep the Ten Commandments which God gave to Moses; Christ is not God but Son of God, our Intercessor at God's right hand; not the saints, but Christ and the Father alone are to be invoked; sins are to be confessed in the churches before God alone; the faithful in confessing to the priest must not tell him their particular sins; there is no need to go on pilgrimages to Etchmiadzin and Jerusalem; the holy ointment or chrism is an imposture and by no means essential to baptism which properly is administered with water only; the orthodox churches and their ordinances may be attended by way of a mask until such time as all, if possible, shall have been won over to the faith.

The main points in another of the confessions are these: Christ is not God; the wood of the Cross is nothing at all; the Armenian baptism and holy ointment are a fraud; to remove the orthodox chrism, mark of the Beast on the forehead, one must be re-baptized; the Virgin Mary is not perpetually virgin; her intercession, like that of all the saints, is vain; the orthodox liturgy, communion and confessional alike are to be rejected, Armenians, Georgians, Russians and all others like them being false Christians and idolaters; genuflexions, crossings and fasts are all to be condemned; the councils of the fathers are spurious, and their canons only the Devil's device.

In 1847 or thereabout some of these sectaries, under pressure of petty persecution in Russian territory returned to their old villages of Khnus and Tchévirmé in Turkish Armenia, where mis-

sionaries of the American Board found them, still zealously propagating their tenets and gaining converts. Thereafter gradually, both in Turkish and in Russian Armenia, Paulicianism is assimilated to the evangelical churches fostered by American missionaries.

The most important net result of the aforementioned inquisition was the seizure of a manuscript volume, in the possession of the sectaries, the *Key of Truth*. The book was a copy of a copy made in 1782 from a lost exemplar by a certain John Vartabedian, then leader of the sect at Tchévirmé, in Taron province. Attention was first drawn to this document, preserved at the time in the archives of the Synod of Etchmiadzin, in 1880, by Alexander Eritzian, and the text was published, with an Introduction and English Translation, by F. C. Conybeare, in 1898. The book has every mark of ancient origin, and it is quite likely that in its pages we meet that Paulician leader of the ninth century, Smbat of Zarehavan himself. This conjecture is borne out by the style of the book, marked as it is by the lucid simplicity of an early age, by the title of the book itself, glancing as it does at "the way, the truth, and the life," of the exordium, reminiscent of the fondness we otherwise know Smbat to have indulged for that dominical phrase, and last of all by the allusion, in the same exordium, to "tribulations of tempestuous times in the land," though "tribulations" as such were nothing unusual for Armenia.

The extant copy, on paper, made early in the nineteenth century, was much mutilated before being surrendered. Of its original 149 pages, 36 are missing entire, while many heretical words throughout the manuscript are carefully erased. However, there is still enough to reveal the true character of the book. The contents, in summary, are as follows: (i). Chaps. 1-20. Doctrinal and controversial matter, hinging on the question of baptism, together with instructions to the ministry (31 pages of Conybeare's text). (ii). Chap. 21. The baptismal service (pages 31-38). (iii). Chap. 22. The ordinal (pages 38-51). (iv). An Appendix of supplementary sections in which the orthodox doctrine of perpetual virginity and the practice of infant baptism are controverted, and the creation of the New Adam, the sole intercessorship of Christ,

the communion of the body and blood, and the last judgment, discussed (pages 51-65).

It is clear from *The Key* that the Paulicians were Unitarian Anabaptists, their Unitarianism being derived from Paul of Samosata and the Alogi, and being therefore of the Adoptionist type. According to this school of thought Christ was not the Word made flesh, by whom all things were created, but a creature who became the Head of a New Creation. To prove its case, the *Key* makes bold to resort to apostolic authority, referring to Hebrews 3:2 in the original Greek, "who was faithful to him that *made* him," and to Romans 5:21, which is paraphrased to read, "By man came death, by man also came salvation."

Born a creature, Christ, as Head of the New Creation, achieved the perfect life, and came at maturity to the Jordan to be baptized of John. There the voice from heaven proclaimed him the Son of God, and then was he "adopted" into the divine Sonship, the Spirit of God resting upon him. Thus and thus only did he become Savior, Intercessor and Lord. If it be asked, How is a sinner saved? the *Key's* answer will be, "Through the intercession of Jesus Christ, by virtue of his merit in life, baptism and death." Beyond that it does not venture.

From its adoptionist Christology the *Key* directly deduces its baptist principles. The baptism of Christ becomes the norm for the Christian believer. As Christ applied for baptism at maturity, so must the Christian, maturity being a matter more than of age alone. To be baptized with Christ is to die with him to the flesh and to be raised up with him to the spirit. Therefore the believer, prior to receiving baptism, which establishes the Christhood of the Christian, must be confirmed in his Christian character. Far from being for infants, the misbelieving or the unbelieving, Christian baptism is for them who like their Lord have been perfected, and as such are in a position to confess sin, both original and actual, and to repose faith in the New Little One of the Kingdom, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. This is in keeping with the practice of John, and of Jesus himself, and of the early Church, until "Satan was loosed." Hence proselytes from the orthodox Churches, baptized in infancy with a spurious baptism, must be rebaptized. The value of an infant dedicatory

service however is recognized, and a very sensible brief name-giving ritual substituted for the orthodox infant baptism observed on the eighth day from birth. The "elect one" or minister visits the home, "to comfort the parents affectionately and to impart to them sound spiritual counsel contemplating the training of the child in godliness, in faith, in hope, in love and in all other good works." This is that "milk for babes" to which the Apostle alludes (1 Cor. 3:1).

Catechumens are examined by the elect one or minister and the rulers (ruling elders) as they are examined among Presbyterians by a church session. Before he can be baptized the catechumen must give evidence of his faith in God as the one only true God, in Christ not as begotten but as made by the Father, and sole Mediator between God and man, in the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, and in the Judgment of the living and the dead at the bar of Christ according to the will of the Father.

About to perform the baptismal rite, the elect one rises to his feet reciting Matthew 11:28-30. Meanwhile the "penitent" goes forward, begging to be released from the bonds of Satan. Before the assembled congregation the candidate kneels in the water professing his faith in Christ as Son of the Living God, and declaring his understanding of the Father as God, of the Son as Mediator, of the Spirit as bestower of all Grace. This confession is followed immediately by a *formal* baptism, commemorative of Johannine baptism, wherein the elect one, with or without the medium of water, administers ritual baptism, but with a mental reservation withholding the Christian sacrament in its true intent (compare Acts 19:1-5). Following this, the scriptures on our Lord's baptism having been read, baptism proper is administered, both formal and real, water being poured on the catechumen's head, kneeling stripped in the water, in the name severally of Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

The ministry is a divine calling. The elect one is the elect one of God and of Jesus Christ. Yet at the same time the minister must be the choice of the people. At his ordination he is brought forward by the rulers of the people, and following due examination by a presiding "elect one" or "bishop," ordained to his holy calling in the presence of the congregation by the laying on of

the hands of the lay elders themselves. The apostolic succession thus is vested, not in the clergy as such, but in the Church, that is, in all believers.

The examination of the candidate has reference solely to personal qualifications, "whether he have perfect wisdom, love which is chief of all, discretion, meekness, humility, uprightness, courage, sanity, and the gift of speech; whether also he have continence, patience, discipline, pastoral ability, love of the poor, pity and civility, and all other good qualities, and repentance together with a keen conscience."¹⁷ And this was the vow that the Paulician elect one took at his ordination: "I am willing to endure chastisements, imprisonments, tortures, insults, crosses, blows, hardships, and all the trials of the world, which our Lord and Mediator and the Catholic Apostolic Holy Church have borne in their persons and endured gladly. I, an unworthy servant of Jesus Christ, with a fervent love and a willing mind, do take upon myself all of these, even to my last breath. Amen."¹⁸

The candidate, called "reader" and "seeker," was given upon his ordination, orthodox fashion, a new name, and was conferred the authority of the keys. The ordaining prayer was repeated in unison by presiding minister and elders. The charges to pastor and people were entirely in scripture readings. Orthodox style, too, the ordination was followed by a period of a forty days' retreat for instruction in New Testament doctrine by the presiding minister.

The parity of the clergy is characteristic and essential. The elect one, teacher, doctor, primate, bishop, apostle and pastor are all one, and all ministerial powers, whether of priesthood, episcopacy, doctorate, apostleship, primacy or election, are alike equal in dignity, and inhere equally in all ministers of Christ. In keeping with this thought it is provided that, unlike the orthodox clergy who usually were selected from among the most pompous looking specimens of humanity, the elect one shall be a man among men, not too tall, nor yet too short, of stature!

The Church is the guardian of the sacraments. Therefore according to the nature of its sacraments a Church is true or false. Having lost the true sacraments, the orthodox Churches no longer are the true Church. Paulicians in more recent times pro-

nounced Protestants and Russian dissenters true. In the view of the *Key*, the Holy Catholic Church is not the Church of the Ecumenical Councils, but the Church that can show itself to have preserved intact the Christian tradition. Churches that have not the true baptism, neither have the true communion. Of the baptism and the communion of the orthodox churches strong language is used. In the administration of orthodox baptism the sponsor is a false witness or a dolt, and the officiating priest an agent of Satan. As to transubstantiation, our Lord, in saying, "This is my body," "This is my blood," knew that the Father did change in actual fact the bread and the wine into his own body and blood, for which cause also he rendered thanks; but false popes do but change the sacred elements now into their own body and blood. Ritualists had better regard the sincerity of all true religion! "The God of all does not bestow upon his loved ones *such* graces, for he is himself sincere, and the grace he bestows likewise is sincere and true."¹⁹

According to the Catechism, probably by a later hand, forming a part of the Appendix, to be a Christian is "to know our Lord Jesus Christ, what he is, and to keep his commandments."²⁰ The commandments of Christ are six in number, Knowledge, Repentance, Faith, Baptism, Communion, and Love, which is chief of all. The saving ordinances are, Repentance, Confession, Baptism and the Communion. Repentance, baptism and the communion are the three only sacraments, instituted by Christ himself. The chrism or holy ointment, ordination, matrimony and extreme unction are not sacraments because not necessary to salvation.

Why?

It remains to inquire why, for all its vitality, Paulicianism failed to become the dominant faith of Armenia. It were hardly satisfactory to find the cause in persecution, though this was long continued and relentless enough. The real cause for the failure must be sought in itself. It was a reforming sect, but its message and mission were mostly negative, and it failed with all essentially negative movements.

The Theology of Paulicianism was fatally defective in its Chris-

tology. Unitarianism never has taken a deep or permanent hold of the Christian masses, who seek not so much a Teacher as a Savior, and will hardly give assent to any doctrine minimizing the divine Saviorhood of Christ. As said one of the Paulicians of the previously mentioned inquisition in his recantation, "Last of all he told me that Christ is not God, and then I understood the falsity of their faith." This unlettered man voiced a common need. To all the reforming doctrines of the Paulicians the orthodox might have given ready assent without feeling that they were guilty of disloyalty to Christ. But when the Deity of Christ was denied, matters assumed an entirely different aspect.

Paulicianism was not adequately equipped to reform Eastern Christianity, for Eastern Christians, despite their image worship and Mariolatry, their meritorious works and superstitions, had a Divine Savior. In any contest with them the only way to win out would have been to make even more of Christ than they knew how. For any one who knew his Bible well that should not have been difficult to do. For there still was room for magnifying Christ through his work. A doctrine of salvation by faith through Christ as the Divine Savior would have added that practical touch to the Logos Doctrine which would have turned speculation and controversy into evangelistic power. Paulicianism lacked that touch. Only as we see this are we prepared to appreciate that immense debt the world owes to the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and to the Apostle Paul.

CHAPTER X

BEGINNINGS OF INDEPENDENCY

THE doctrine of the Armenian Church has undergone no material modification since the period of the first three Ecumenical Councils. Having once adhered to the crucial teaching of the Deity of Christ, the Church consistently discouraged thereafter what was deemed to be fruitless speculation. To get the proper setting of the Armenian Church, therefore, we must here review in some detail the course of general Church History in the fourth and fifth centuries.

In the year 318 the so-called Arian controversy opened. Arius, from whom it takes its name, was a presbyter of Alexandria who taught that Christ, while Creator of the world, was himself a creature of God. He attributed his doctrine to Lucian of Antioch, a disciple in turn of Paul of Samosata. Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, challenged Arius, insisting that Christ was the eternally begotten Son, consubstantial with the Father. In 321 Arius was deposed and excommunicated by a local synod. However, driven from Alexandria, he continued his agitation, first in Palestine, and later at Nicomedia, then Capital of the Empire. Eusebius of Nicomedia, and his namesake, of Cesarea in Palestine, the Church historian, hastening to Arius' defence, the whole East soon was a theological battleground.

The Council of Nicaea

To settle the controversy, Constantine the Great, in the twentieth year of his reign (325 A.D.), summoned the Bishops of the Empire to Nicaea, then a flourishing city of Bithynia south of the Bay of Nicomedia, to meet in ecclesiastical council. There were present at the gathering when assembled 318 Bishops of the Church at large, approximately one-sixth of the total number in the Empire, the Latin Church sending eight delegates. The Council affirmed the true Deity of the Son, and declared Christ consubstantial (*homo-ousios*) with the Father. Eusebius of Cesarea was so far from giving his hearty support to the Nicene Creed, that he did not sign his name to it but only after a full

day's deliberation, and felt it necessary subsequently to vindicate his act by a special letter to his Palestinian constituents. Several others signed reluctantly, only three of the delegates, however, one of them Arius himself, refusing to sign at all.

The Council of Nicaea did not settle, it only opened, the Trinitarian controversy. The year 328 marks the accession of Athanasius to the episcopate of Alexandria. For forty-five years this prelate stood forth as the great champion of orthodoxy. However, he had a checkered career. In 335 a Synod at Jerusalem acquitted Arius of the charge of heresy, and Athanasius, through the influence of an Arian Synod at Constantinople, was banished in the following year to Gaul. Following the death of Constantine, Athanasius was recalled from exile (338); but Constantius, the son and successor of Constantine, being in his sympathies a semi-Arian, made Eusebius of Nicomedia Bishop of Constantinople, and once more deposed Athanasius. The latter now fled to Rome, where Pope Julius called a Synod in his defence, and condemned his opponents (341). Meanwhile a Synod at Antioch confirmed the deposition of Athanasius, denouncing Arianism, but at the same time rejecting the formula *homo-ousios*.

Much of the difficulty throughout the controversy grew out of the fact that in this period theology had not as yet fixed accurately the distinction between *substance* and *person* (*ousia* and *hypostasis*). In the Nicene Creed as originally drawn up *hypostasis* and *ousia* were used interchangeably, and these terms were frequently interchanged by Athanasius himself, who also used *physis* interchangeably with them. In fact so late as the Council of Chalcedon (451), *physis* and *ousia* are interchangeably used, *ousia* being employed now in the sense of *substance*, and again in the sense of *nature*. Note the clause, "*consubstantial* with the Father as to his Godhead, *consubstantial* with us as to his manhood," where plainly not the same sort of consubstantiality in both cases is meant. This ambiguity in terminology is reflected in the literature of Armenia, and appears in so late a writer as John of Otzun, of the early eighth century. Here was the germ of many of the misunderstandings incident to the early Christological controversies.

Athanasius died in 373. The three great Cappadocian Bishops,

Basil and the two Gregories, then stepped into the breach. In a small church in Constantinople Gregory Nazianzen preached those discourses on the Deity of Christ which won for him the title of "The Theologian," or "The Divine." The controversy was embittered by the constant interference of the civil power, which until the accession of Theodosius I favored the Arian party. This Emperor, a Spaniard by birth, however raised Gregory Nazianzen to the Patriarchal chair, banned Arianism, and called a second Ecumenical Council, to meet at Constantinople, in May of 381. At this gathering there were but 150 Bishops present, 36 semi-Arian Macedonians (followers of Macedon) having walked out, while the Latin West was not represented at all. This Council framed no new symbol, but re-adopted the Nicene Creed with only some minor changes, including the insertion of a clause respecting the Deity of the Holy Spirit, co-equal and co-eternal with the Father and the Son, by the Arians pronounced but a creature of the Son and subordinate to him. The Nicene Creed, as first formulated at Nicaea, supplemented at Constantinople, and confirmed at Chalcedon (451), is substantially the Creed of the Armenian Church.

To be more specific, the Armenian Creed is that form of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan symbol commonly attributed to Athanasius, and by many thought to have a Gallican origin. It embodies a clause condemning the Apollinarian heresy, Apollinaris, a native of Alexandria, and Bishop of Laodicea in Syria (died 390 A.D.), having attributed to Christ a human body and soul, but not a human rational spirit, which last he held was replaced by the Divine Logos, the whole forming *one nature*. He charged that the orthodox doctrine of the full humanity of Christ limited his atoning passion to the human nature only. The Armenian Creed glances at the Apollinarians condemned at the Council of Constantinople in this clause: "He assumed body, soul and mind and all that in man is, in reality and not in appearance."

The Nestorian heresy emerged as a reflex from Apollinarianism. Nestorius from whom it derives its name was at the time Patriarch of Constantinople (428-31). He denounced the term "bearer-of-God" applied to the Virgin Mary by Origen, Athanasius, Basil and others, and substituted for it "bearer-of-Christ."

The Nestorian Christology pushed the dual nature of Christ to the extreme of a double personality, regarding him not as God become man, but the reverse. "He," declares Nestorius, "who was formed in the womb of Mary, was not himself God, but God *assumed* him, and on account of him who assumed, he who was assumed also is called God." He says also that the Son of God, but not God the Son, died on the Cross. These are distinctions worthy of a Paul of Samosata. In truth, Nestorianism was not original with Nestorius. He had precursors in Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia.

To compose the controversy, the Emperors of East and West jointly called another universal Council, the Third, to assemble in June, 431, in the city of Ephesus, where now the worship of the Virgin Mary replaced that of the Virgin Diana. The number of Bishops present was 198, afterward increased to 240. It was a tumultuous assembly, faction hurling anathema against faction in the true Ephesian style. Its immediate task was a negative one only, namely, the condemnation of Nestorianism. As usual, controversy raged after the Council had adjourned. A Creed drawn up by Theodoret, a Syrian Bishop, native of Antioch, was put forward by the Antiochean party (433), indicating a way of compromise, by the acceptance of the formula, "bearer-of-God," and the condemnation at the same time of the "one nature" doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria (376-444). Cyril consented to the new Creed. Nestorius was exiled and died in obscurity. The compromise Creed embodied the ambiguous clause relative to Christ's "consubstantiality," a formula which each party could understand as it would. The Antiocheans construed it in its strictly dualistic sense, making Christ's consubstantiality with the Father of the same order as his consubstantiality with men, and seeing in it their favorite double personality. The Alexandrians, headed by Cyril, held to the consubstantiality of Christ with the Father in the transcendent sense, and his consubstantiality with us in the generic sense, and referred thus the proper personality of Christ to the Deity of which they regarded the humanity as an accident only.

The Council of Chalcedon

Cyril died in 444. His successor in the Episcopal chair of Alexandria, Dioscurus, now headed the Monophysite party, against the Antiocheans, though Eutyches, abbot of a cloister at Constantinople, is known to history as the representative Monophysite of this time. At Dioscurus' instigation the Emperor Theodosius II called a general Council at Ephesus in 449. There were present 135 Bishops. The assembly came to be known as the "Robber Council," held by the extreme Monophysites to be the true Fourth Ecumenical Council. Under protection of an armed guard Dioscurus presided, while the opposing faction were not permitted to open their mouths. Flavian, the Bishop of Constantinople, was so severely maltreated that soon afterward he died of his injuries. The Council affirmed the orthodoxy of Eutyches, endorsed the Twelve Anathemas of Cyril against Nestorius, condemned Diophysitism as a heresy, and deposed and excommunicated its advocates, Theodore and the Bishops of Constantinople and Rome.

With the accession of Marcian, however, the fortunes of the Church's Christology were reversed. In May, 451, this Emperor called an Ecumenical Council to meet at Nicaea to review the decisions of Ephesus. The Council met accordingly, but, owing to the turbulence of the members, was later removed under the Emperor's eye, to Chalcedon, the Brooklyn of Constantinople. Between five and six hundred delegates, the largest number ever present at any Ecumenical Council, were in attendance. At the first session the decisions of the Robber Synod were declared null and void. At subsequent sessions a Confession of Faith was adopted, reiterating the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, endorsing Theodore's formula, and declaring Christ, in the language of Pope Leo I in his famous letter to Flavian, "Son, Lord, Only-Begotten, known in two natures, without confusion, without conversion, without severance, and without division." The decisions of Chalcedon were ratified by royal edict, and all Eutychians ordered banished from the Empire, their writings burnt.

For thirty years the controversy raged unabated, until in 482 the Emperor Zeno issued his *Henoticon*, a formula of concord

ignoring the Chalcedonian Creed, condemning both Nestorianism and Eutychianism, and proposing future avoidance of all disputed questions and expressions. The *Henoticon*, however, far from accomplishing its intended object, became only a cause for further conflict. The Bishop of Rome, Felix II, rejected it, and withdrew from communion with the East (484). The Armenians, unlike the Diophysites and the extreme Monophysites, approved it (491), thus identifying themselves with the Moderate Alexandrian or Cyrillian Monophysites.²¹ East and West, however, in 519 were reunited, reaffirming the position of Chalcedon. All Monophysite Bishops were deposed and fled to Alexandria. The Armenians, with all Moderate Monophysites, were left out in the cold.

Justinian the Great made an earnest attempt to restore the Monophysites to the fold. He ratified in his Code the Four Ecumenical Councils, while at the same time, by an ecclesiastical decree of 533, giving sanction to the Monophysite formula, "God was crucified for us." This formula was approved twenty years later by the Fifth Ecumenical Council, the Second of Constantinople, though not as an addition, in the Monophysite style, to the Trisagion, "Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, Who wast crucified for us, Have mercy upon us." To this the Pope refused concurrence.

The Divinely Wrought Redemption

When we examine carefully into the Monophysite controversy, we become convinced that the sole object of the reputed dissenters was to safeguard the divinely wrought redemption. It is their Theology and their Soteriology, neither of them under question, that together determine their Christology. We of today, Diophysites though we be in our Christology, are forced to the Theopaschite Monophysite position when we would really understand the saving work of our Lord. We feel that it is a suffering God, not Man, that makes the Cross of Calvary significant. The letter of Pope Leo I to Flavian itself affirms as much. "The impassible God," writes Leo, "became a suffering man; the Immortal One submitted himself to the dominion of death."

The reader who cares to pursue further the Armenian teaching

of the One Nature, will find a classical vindication of it in the *Tractate of John of Otsun against the Phantasiastae* (see Appendix II). Here we only pause to show how the Armenian *Hymnary* itself is fairly saturated with Theopaschite doctrine; and it should be stated that the hymns of the Armenian Church, a specially rich collection dating from all the centuries from the fifth to the thirteenth, where they are not recitative are doctrinal.

The doctrine of the Virgin Birth removes the deity of Christ from the realm of mere speculation and lends to it the character of the pragmatic. Mary is Bearer-of-God, a formula constantly reiterated to show that the Holy One who was born of her was God himself made flesh.

Thee, Virgin and Mother,
Throne of the Divine Incarnation,
While we praise and extol Him who is Savior of the
souls of men,
Thee also, Bearer-of-God and Virgin,
Do we praise both as Mother and as Handmaiden of
our Savior.

The Virgin is called the Unconsumed Bush, the Earthly Seraph, the Tree of Life, Gideon's Fleece, Ezekiel's Gate, and the Sun-Rising of the Sun of Righteousness.

The Deity of the Incarnate Christ is constantly reiterated. Christ was not severally perfect God and perfect Man, but

This day appeared He on earth,
Perfect God and Man.

He who was born of Mary was very God. Wherein then lies the justification for affirming of Christ "one nature"? The answer is, God himself, a Trinity, has one nature or substance; so also must we understand the duality of Christ in his divine and human aspects as subsisting in "one nature." Which plainly means that the Incarnation was nothing accidental or apparent, through a simple concurrence of the two natures side by side, but that it was *essential* and *real*.

It follows from all this that the sufferings of Christ are a divine Sacrifice.

This day was offered up for us
A Sacrifice, even the Unblemished Lamb of God,
Co-existent with the Father and with the Holy Spirit,
Upon the Cross, O God of our fathers!

Therefore Christ's death was a voluntary death, endured solely
for our salvation.

Thou Who in ineffable being
Art co-sharer of the Father's glory,
Didst voluntarily consent
To suffer in the flesh for us.

Thou Lamb of God,
Who wentest willingly to the death of the Cross
To bear away the sins of the world,
By thy voluntary sufferings, O Christ,
Have mercy upon us.

All this is summed up in the saying that he tasted death by the
Father's own will.

The effects and implications of the death of Christ may be thus
summed up. Through the blood of Christ God is reconciled to
us, and our sins forgiven. The death of Christ is a vicarious
sacrifice. Abraham saw the Day of Christ in Isaac. For even as
Isaac was saved by the substitutionary sacrifice on Mount Moriah,
so are we saved by the substitutionary sacrifice on Calvary. Christ
may be received into the heart by faith "as once Simeon received
Him into his arms." Saints and martyrs are crucified with Christ,
and are "elect" for their voluntary deaths.

It has been, and sometimes still is represented that the doctrinal
position of the Armenian Church was the outcome of political
embarrassment and misinformation. Political embarrassment
there certainly was, for just when the Council of Chalcedon was
being called, the Armenians were at the climax of their bloody
struggle with Persian Zoroastrianism, and the Armenian Catholi-
cos and several of his clergy were carried off into captivity at
Ctesiphon. In the circumstances it was both unwise and impos-
sible to share in the deliberations of Chalcedon. But the Monophy-
site Christology was under discussion for a hundred years after-

ward, and the foregoing survey serves to make it plain that Armenian Christological opinion, reinforced by that discussion, was neither hasty nor preoccupied.

In any case the Church historian must regret that narrow intolerance of the majority which could excommunicate the Moderate Monophysites. For despite the diversity of shibboleths the two parties differed but little from each other in their true intent. Schaff says that according to the Creed of Chalcedon "the personal self-conscious ego resides in the Logos," and that the person of Christ consists "in such a union of the human and the divine natures that the divine nature is the seat of self-consciousness, and pervades and animates the human."²² But if this be a correct representation of the case, wherein does the Chalcedonian Creed itself materially differ from the moderate Monophysite position?

The Armenian Era

But schisms are not always occasioned by doctrinal differences alone, and in the case of the Armenians more strictly ecclesiastical exigencies were mixed up with the doctrinal.

At a Synod of Tevin, 551 A.D., under their Catholicos Nerses II, the Armenians declared themselves an independent Church, by designating the ensuing year as the Year One of the Armenian ecclesiastical era. Ormanian is at a loss to account for either the date or the cause. "The year 552," he writes, "is marked neither by any event significant to the Armenians, nor by circumstance worthy of note."²³ Ormanian who has left nothing in the Armenian writers, published or unpublished, unread, can find no explanation for the Armenian Era. The pronouncement, nevertheless, if surprising, has its own explanation, namely, that the secession was trumpeted abroad as little as possible, especially as the Armenians by no means would have owned up to the status of schismatics. Indeed they themselves were the true Church, and the Chalcedonists the schismatics! For even if by their action they brought upon themselves the guilt of dividing the Church, they could not be so guilty as the Diophysites who, like Nestorius, divided Christ himself!

But if the chroniclers maintain a discreet silence, even so it is yet possible for us to pry into the real situation. In the year 530

Justinian invested the Patriarch of Constantinople with all the powers of a Pope of the East. For some hundred years now the Bishops of Rome had been gradually displacing those of Alexandria at the head of the Church in the Empire. But when in the year named Justinian designated the Bishop of Constantinople as the final Court of Appeals for all the Bishops of the East, it seemed to the Monophysites like bringing the Papacy rather too close home, a Papacy, too, that was heretical! In the period 540-70 A.D. the secessionist tendency of the Monophysite churches gained special impetus. The death of Justinian's Consort, the Empress Theodora, in 547, removed the great imperial protector of those churches. Then followed what is specially significant, and Ormanian overlooks, the Centennial Year, 551, of the Council of Chalcedon. In that year the Armenians seem to have judged that if a century of controversy had not served to settle the Chalcedonian dispute, it surely was time for them to secede! In 584, also, under Moses II, having always looked to Cesarea and Alexandria for their ecclesiastical guidance, they adopted the Alexandrian Easter Cycle, which, until discarded in 1824, served further to emphasize the breach.²⁴ In the reign of this Catholicos (596), too, they excommunicated their neighbors, the Georgians, who sixteen years earlier had given in their adherence to the Council of Chalcedon.

To compose the differences between the church factions, the Emperor Maurice in the following year called a Synod to meet at his Capital. Greeks, Georgians and Armenians from Byzantine Armenia were present, together with two representatives of the Armenian Catholicos. The Synod, however, came to nothing, and for the following three years Maurice (himself an Armenian) forbade his countrymen of Roman Armenia to have anything to do with the Catholicos in Persia. A rival prelate was set up in Byzantine territory (590-611). When to avenge the murder of his friend and benefactor Maurice with his five children Khosrov II made war on Phocas, one of the Persian generals, also an Armenian, deported this rival Catholicos, together with a large number of captives taken at Theodosiopolis, to Hamadan. Three years later the Persians captured Jerusalem, and with other booty carried off to Persia the reputed True Cross (614). With another

turn of fortune, however, the Byzantines in 620 penetrated the territory of the enemy as far as Tabriz, which city they destroyed. The Emperor Heraclius in 629, having recovered the True Cross, climaxed his Persian victories with a Synod at Theodosiopolis, where the Catholicos Ezras was forced to give in his signature to the Chalcedonian formula, an act which gained him on the Roster of Armenian Catholici an inverted initial!

CHAPTER XI

CONTROVERSIES AND OVERTURES

HOR controversies have raged over the doctrinal positions and usages of the Armenian Church.

Controversies with the Greeks

The first of these occurred in the time of the Emperor Heraclius, in the initial year of the Catholicos Ezras, commonly called Ezr (629). After his notable victories over the Persians, the Emperor came to Theodosiopolis and ordered a Synod of Greek and Armenian Bishops straightway to be convened to consider the matter of the Armenian defection. Disputes recently had been rife in the region through many Armenians having accepted the Council of Chalcedon, and the Emperor sent word to Ezr at Tevin that if the latter failed to attend the proposed synod, a rival Catholicos would be appointed in Roman Armenia. Accordingly Ezr went, and under assurance that the Greeks were not Nestorians, put his seal to the decisions of the Fourth Council. However, he returned home only to face obloquy, the learned Warden of the Cathedral Church of the Illuminator at Tevin refusing even to go out to welcome according to custom the returning prelate, and, when brought forcibly before him, denouncing him to his face. "Rightly," said he, "have you been named Ezr ("end"), for you have brought the Armenian Church to an end." The Warden had the majority of the same mind with him. Long the name of Ezr was written in the roster of the Catholici with an inverted initial.

But many of the Armenians of Garin province, following the Synod of Theodosiopolis went beyond an acquiescence in the doctrinal decisions of Chalcedon, observing the eucharist with leavened bread and mixed wine, intoning the Trisagion without the words, "who wast crucified for us," and celebrating Christmas on December 25. Nor was the Warden far wrong in believing that the very existence of the Armenian Church was menaced by any concession to the Greeks. A fraction of Greek Uniats sur-

viving down to our own time, known as "Armenian Greeks," Greeks, that is, by language, Armenians by race, shows how, more than the question of religious conformity, the rights of the National Church, and the very principle of nationality, in reality were at stake.

In the bi-centennial year of the Council of Chalcedon (651), at a Synod at Manazkert, the action of Ezras was repudiated. At a Synod of Tevin, in 719, under the Catholicos John of Otzun, the schism was reaffirmed. It was provided that the bread of the Communion must be unleavened, and the wine unmixed, according to the reputed tradition of Gregory the Illuminator, without regard to the practice of "other Christian nations." "Who wast crucified for us," must be thrice repeated with the Trisagion, and at no time omitted from the Liturgy.

Nine years later, Germanus, the Patriarch of Constantinople, addressed to the Armenians an epistle about reunion, wherein he reassured them as regarded the orthodoxy of the Fourth Ecumenical Council and the formula of the "two natures." The letter reached Armenia in the last days of John, and went by default.

The Patriarch Photius (858-67) persecuted all Armenians in Roman territory, dubbing them Jacobites. In 862 the Catholicos Zecharias addressed to him a letter stating that Armenians understood the Council of Chalcedon to be contrary to the first three Ecumenical Councils, and of Nestorian tendency. "We," he declared, "are not disciples of Jacob Zanzalus, from whom the Jacobites are named, nor of Julian of Halicarnassus, nor of Peter the Fuller, nor yet of Eutyches, but of Gregory the Illuminator only." Photius in a reply patronizingly wrote that at the time of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, being engaged in a conflict with the Persians in defence of their faith, the Armenians had been prevented from sending delegates to that Council, and afterward had been misinformed and misled by the Syrians. The Fourth Council, he declared, "affirmed the two natures to be united in one identical person in order to silence Nestorius, Theodore (of Mopsuestia) and Dioscurus, and employed the term 'of two natures,' to silence those denying either the deity or the humanity." This reply was forwarded through the Bishop of Nicaea,

apparently to lend it an added prestige of orthodoxy, and utilize at the same time racial sympathies, the Bishop seemingly being an Armenian in the Greek communion.

The Synod of Shiragavan in the same year (862) was the Armenians' direct reply to this letter. The deliverances of this synod, almost entirely doctrinal, form a compendium of the Christian faith of Armenia. In the Godhead, there is one nature in three Persons, the Spirit being of the same substance equally with the Father and the Son. The Son, while remaining inseparable from the Father and the Spirit, was incarnated through the Virgin Mary. The Word of God united with human flesh, thus being, by an ineffable union, without separation and without confusion, at the same time both eternal God and true Man. The Virgin is Theotokos, Mother of God the Word, who was begotten of God before all time, and in time was born of the Virgin Mary, in the form of a servant. The Nestorian teaching that the Word of God dwelt with a perfect human child, is to be condemned as making a distinction between the natures and the persons; so likewise is the Eutychean teaching that the Word of God brought down with him to earth a body of his own, of a different nature from ours, and hence was not in very truth incarnated, or that the divine nature was confused with the human, which would make our salvation void. The true doctrine is that the Word of God became flesh, the perfect God became united with perfect Man, two natures subsisting in one person, Christ being of the same *substance* with the Father according to the Godhead, and of the same *nature* with us according to the manhood, in all respects but sin. The Holy Trinity is not passible; yet while the Son did not suffer in his Godhead alone, as teach Eutyches and the Manichaeans, neither did he suffer in his manhood alone, as teaches Nestorius. The Word of God suffered rather in a body undetachable from the deity, the impassible and inseparable deity being in both the flesh and the passion, yet without bodily suffering. Our Lord Jesus Christ is the Eternal Word in the bosom of the Father, who, in the flesh, was crucified for our salvation, being in himself both priest and sacrifice. The Son of God became the Son of the Virgin that he might present the sons of men as the sons of God. Christ was born of the Virgin perfect, glorious and incorruptible, and passible not from neces-

sity but by choice. The prophetical and apostolical traditions are not to be severed the one from the other, neither are the deliverances of Nicaea, Constantinople and Ephesus to be taken in detachment from them. As to the Council of Chalcedon, if it be contrary to the prophetical and apostolical traditions, and to the first three Ecumenical Councils, it is to be rejected; if the Council of Chalcedon, or any subsequent Council, including the Seventh (the Second of Nicaea, 787 A.D.), be in accord with the three first Councils and the apostolical and prophetical writings, they are to be accepted. The burden of proof lies on the Greeks.

Zecharias' successors, among them Mashtotz and John VI, down to the year 967, were thoroughgoing Monophysites. In this year the Catholicos Vahan, a contemporary of the Emperors Basil II and Constantine IX, adopted the Diophysite position, and was in consequence compelled to seek refuge in the dominions of King Gagik, of Vaspuragan, where also he found ready disciples in the Bishop, Khosrov the Great, and in his son, Gregory of Nareg. It is now an all but forgotten episode that this Gregory, author of the Prayer-Book and saint, once derisively was nicknamed "Deficient" (*scil.* in the faith).

The Emperors of the East bent every energy to subjugate the independent princes of northern Armenia, and it was a part of this policy to bring the Armenian Catholicate also under the Greek Patriarch. In 1045 Ani, capital of the Bagratides, was surrendered to the Greeks, and the Catholicos Hatchik II became an exile at Constantinople. Following his death the election of a new Catholicos was for months obstructed. That was a fateful policy which led the Byzantines to seek doubtful ecclesiastical and political gains like these at the cost of many hard feelings and bloodshed. The Turk and the Tatar were now at the gate, and discretion should have dictated mutual forbearance and a united front against the common foe. The Greeks kept Ani for twenty years, and lost it to Alp Arslan.

Immediately after the battle of Manazkert (1071) the disintegration of the Eastern Roman Empire sets in. An Armenian prince with the Arab name of Abul-Gharib, who calls himself "Duke of Vaspuragan," in 1072 is found in occupation of Tarsus in Cilicia, his dominions including Mopsuestia (Mesis), Adana,

and the fortresses of Baberon and Lambron. In 1080 Reuben, a prince of the Bagratide house of Kars, establishes himself in the mountains of Cilicia capturing some Greek fortresses to the northward, and founds thus the Reubenian dynasty of the kingdom of Cilician Armenia. In 1083 Edessa (Urfa) falls to the renegade Armenian Philaretus, who extends his rule over the Amanus. In the following year (1084) the Seljukian Sultanate of Rum comes into being, whose capital first was at Sebastea (Sivas), and afterward at Iconium (Konia).

Early Relations with Rome

In such turbulent times lived the Catholicos Gregory II (1066-1105). He was a son of Gregory Magistros (died c. 1058), conferred at his baptism the name of Vahram, and surnamed Martyrophil from his fondness for collecting legends of the martyrs. Gregory, by consent of the Emperor Constantine X, secured by the exiled King Gagik, of Kars, at a cost of much treasure and landed property, was consecrated Catholicos at Gagik's new capital of Zamanta, near Amasea, in 1066.

The times called for a pacific attitude on the part of a Catholicos. Unsettled political conditions easily led to ecclesiastical disruptions. During a twenty-year period of Gregory's office, extending from 1070 to 1090, four rival catholici sprang up at one time in different parts of the Church's territory, at Ani, at Aghtamar, at Honi and at Marash. To be a Catholicos in those times was to be a wanderer over the face of the earth. After the fall of Ani city, its Catholicos resided by turns at Theodosiopolis, Sebastea, Tarentium and Tavplur. Gregory himself, when not away in Egypt, Palestine or Constantinople (1067-72), resided at Zamanta, at Sasun, Ani, and in the Amanus, dying at Kesun (near Marash) in 1105. He was at Jerusalem on a manuscript hunt in 1099, when that city was captured by the First Crusaders.

Several times Gregory journeyed to Constantinople on ecclesiastical errands, and, during the reign of his namesake, Pope Gregory VII, about 1074, visited Rome. It is hard to believe that his mission was not as much political and humanitarian as it was ecclesiastical. The Pope, it is said, made certain inquiries relative to the doctrines and usages of the Armenian Church. Did the

Armenians reject the Fourth Ecumenical Council? Did they receive Dioscurus of Alexandria? Did they mix no water at all with the eucharistic wine? And did they indeed make their chrism or muron from sesame oil instead of olive? The Pope warned the Catholicos about the Theopaschite addition to the Trisagion which was sure to cause scandal, and commended the Armenians for using, like the Latins, unleavened wafers in the holy Eucharist. In 1080 the Pope wrote a letter to the Catholicos touching these matters which is preserved. In this time (1084) falls the adoption by the Armenians of the Julian Calendar. For a hundred years following there is no written correspondence between Popes and Catholicos extant, until, that is, the year 1182, when Pope Lucius II writes to the Catholicos Gregory IV.

Gregory III and the Syrians

Gregory III, and his brother and immediate successor, Nerses IV, surnamed the Graceful, were grand-nephews of Gregory II. They were sons of Abirad, an Armenian baron who took up his residence within the confines of the Latin County of Edessa, in the Fortress of Dzovk (Dlouk), near the modern Aintab, where the boys were born. The parents, having destined them for the Church, committed them at a tender age to their father's maternal uncle, Gregory II, who, however, died when Nerses, the younger of the two, as yet was but four years of age. Gregory III (1113-67) established the patriarchal chair on his old paternal estate which fell within the territory of the French Crusader Joslin de Courtenay (1116), and removed it later to Romgla (Rum Kaleh), on the upper Euphrates, within the same dominions (1149).

Gregory III proved himself a man of peace. Someone (it was reported he himself) had written a book against the Syrian Jacobites, pointing out their errors, chief among them being their extreme Monophysitism, whereof their practice of crossing themselves with one finger only was characteristically symbolical! The eminent Jacobite scholar Barsalibi replied with a volume of his own, wherein he enumerated the errors of the Armenians, some thirty-five practices allegedly uncanonical, including their unleavened bread, their unmixed chalice, their Easter flesh-offerings, their joint celebration of Christmas and Epiphany, their use of

sesame oil in the chrism, their withholding the gospels from the laity, their hereditary priesthood, and the "dead hand" at their ordinations. Writing of the wont of withholding the scriptures from the laity, a practice to which Armenians until recent times, from policy and not from canonical restraint, have been only too much addicted, he demands witheringly of his opponent:

Tell us where you learned this. It is indeed not suitable for laymen to read publicly the Gospel for the congregation, as a priest does; but if a believer reads it for himself and takes benefit from it, why do you deprive him of such a grace?²⁶

The Armenians' use of other ingredients in addition to olive oil in their chrism grew perhaps out of a desire to magnify the ordinance.²⁸ From the Syrian's standpoint, however, the argument against the Armenian practice is unanswerable.

If there are no olive trees in Armenia they are found in the regions of Neo-Cesarea which is in close proximity to Armenia. Lo, your people have taken possession of Syria, why then did not your Bishops who are in it make use of olive oil? We Syrians who live in Melitene and in the North have also no olive oil and opobalsam that comes from Egypt, but we import them with great care and make use of them in the sacrament of the holy Chrism.²⁷

The Syrian's book was published in recent years in England by Mingana; we only could wish we also had the Armenian volume that served as the provocation for it. But alas! it having been noised abroad that the Syrian's work had found its way into the Library of Drazarg, the monastic residence of the Catholicos, at Sis, a great popular uproar ensued. To lay, therefore, all disturbing rumors, Gregory took both books, of which his own would seem to have had no second copy, and publicly burned them (1134).

A great popular controversy raged also in this reign between the Armenians and the Syrian Nestorians in the region to the east of Telguran, between Urfa and Merdin. The Armenians criticized the Nestorians for making the eucharistic wafer with olive oil and salt; the Nestorians parried by denouncing the Armenian animal offerings and cheese. Nor were Christological

controversies entirely dormant. Some Armenian priests of Paulician leanings made common cause with the Nestorians, asking, If Christ was both God and Man, in which one of his natures did he die? And if the nature was one and divine, was it God himself that died? Again the Theopaschite controversy was acute, and Apollinarian Phantasiasticism was abroad in the land.

Through Ariuz, Armenian Prince of Telguran, the Catholicos came to take an interest in the situation, and directed his brother Nerses to address to the people of that region an epistle, still extant, dealing with the subjects in dispute. First of all, says Nerses in this epistle, it is not wise for the unlearned to dispute about matters that even the learned have found difficult, and, apparently realizing that even the unlearned could not well rest there, goes on to explain that owing to the inseparable union of the deity and the humanity in one person, it is just as correct to affirm the death of the deity as it is to attribute divine power to the humanity. "What you do not understand by the inquiry of your mind, you will soon understand by the venture of your faith." Whoever refuses assent to this is to be rejected.

As to animal sacrifices, Nerses explains that they were instituted by Gregory the Illuminator to provide a living for the early pagan priests ordained to the Christian priesthood, and that they took the place of the *agape* of the apostolic Church, by no means partaking of the nature of a blood atonement as sometimes alleged, but affording aid to the Church's poor, and having a parallel in Latin usage, by which at Eastertide a lamb is roasted, blessed on the altar, and distributed to the people.

Coming to the Paulicians, who denounce church edifices, confessionals, holy crosses and utensils, and declare, "We are the Church," Nerses says that believers indeed are the spiritual Church, but that this does not subsist without its material symbols, like the cross, the service-book, the Bible and the sanctuary. He maintains that reverence paid to the cross is not to the material from which the cross is made, but to the Christ whom the cross brings to mind, and even so, not until it has been anointed and consecrated is the cross properly revered. The consecration of churches, he says, likewise is an ancient practice, and concludes

by advising the reading of Ananias of Nareg against the Paulicians.

Once More the Latins

In 1139 Gregory III, with his distinguished brother, attended a Synod of the Latins at Antioch, where a question of an episcopal succession was settled. As resident of a Latin dominion, the Catholicos was an honored spectator. After the Synod he accompanied the Pope's nuncio to Jerusalem, where the Church of Mt. Zion was rededicated. In the Holy City some matters were discussed leading, according to the Latin chronicler, to a promise on the part of the Armenian Catholicos to correct "many things."

Pope Honorius II (1124-30) is reputed to have written in this reign urging the Catholicos to celebrate Christmas and Epiphany with the Catholic Church, and to mix water with the eucharistic wine. His successor, Innocent II (1130-43), seems to have written Gregory in 1141 to the same purpose. This led to the Armenians sending in 1145 to Pope Eugenius III (1145-53) at Viterbo a delegation whose object, however, appears to have been mainly political. For this was immediately following the death of the Armenian Prince of Cilicia in captivity at Constantinople and the fall of Edessa to the Seljukian Turks, and just before the preaching of the ill-fated Second Crusade.

Some ecclesiastical questions are said to have been referred to the arbitration of the Pope, namely, the divergence in practice between Greeks and Armenians in the celebration of Christmas and Epiphany, which the Armenians observe conjointly, and the Greeks separately, and that other in the observance of the Eucharist, in which the Greeks use leavened bread, and the Armenians unmixed wine. Incidentally the Armenians asked the Pope whether he judged it legitimate to baptize infants of infidels brought to them from superstitious motives. We are not told what judgment the Pope rendered in this particular matter, or in that of the church holidays. But he invited the messengers to attend mass, which he was about to celebrate in person, and to judge for themselves of the proprieties in the Eucharist. The Armenians, witnessing during the service a supernal light in which two doves mysteriously fluttered about, are said to have

concluded that the Latins must have the true tradition in the case! This, of course, we have from a Latin source only.

Greek Overtures

Politically the Armenians were still at this time a factor to be reckoned with. Unlike the Greeks, they had helped the Crusaders in every possible way, giving them free passage through their territories, providing guides and military advisers, and furnishing men and supplies. The Greeks now saw better than ever the need of conciliating a people that could help as much as hinder them, and the more as the near past was embittered by strife, the present fraught with danger.

The surrender of Ani to the Greeks had left behind it an inheritance of hate aggravated by religious antipathies. An episode characteristic of the time was the slaying of Marcus, Bishop of Cesarea in Cappadocia, by the last King of Kars, the fugitive Gagik. The King had the Greek Bishop sewed up in a sack with the huge pet dog the latter had insultingly named Armen, and caused him to be torn in pieces by the beast infuriated under the rod. In revenge Gagik was slain by the Greek Mandalian Brothers, petty princes of the Anti-Taurus, and these in turn were destroyed by the Armenian Toros (Theodorus) I, of Cilicia. The feud was but a part of a greater conflict.

Toros was succeeded by his brother Leo (1123-36), first Cilician prince of that name, who sided now with the Latins, and again with the Turks, according to the exigencies of war, but always against the Greeks. Captured in 1135 by the Latins, Leo was held a prisoner at Antioch, only to be set free in the following year to help in a conflict of the Antiocheans against the Emperor John Comnenus. Leo, with a mixed Latin and Armenian force, in 1137 laid siege to Seleucia, which city, however, he was forced to relinquish to hasten to the defence of Anazarbus. This Cilician fortress the Greeks captured, and leaving a small force to defend Vahga, attacked and reduced Antioch. Leo, with his two sons, Reuben and Toros, surrendered to the enemy, who conveyed them to Constantinople, where Leo died in captivity (1143). The Greeks mercilessly destroyed the Cilician cities, castles, convents and churches.

Profiting by the embarrassments of the Armenians, the Seljuk Sultan of Iconium in 1149 captured Marash, and in 1151 Kesun. Upon the fall of Marash to the Turks, the Catholicos removed his see to Romgla, most important of the fortresses of those parts still left to the Franks, Gregory III acquiring it from Joslin III in exchange for lands in Cilicia which Toros II, escaped from his captivity at Constantinople, was fast reconquering. For 142 years Romgla served as the seat of the Armenian Catholicos, and there were gathered the remains of Gregory II, Gregory III, and Nerses IV. When in 1292 Romgla, after Acre, fell to the Egyptians, the Catholicate was returned to Sis, capital of Cilicia, there to remain until its restoration in 1441 to Etchmiadzin.

In 1153 the Armenians of Cilicia signed a treaty of amity with the Sultan of Iconium which enhanced their prestige in the Anatolian peninsula. Six years later (1159), after a fifteen years' war, the Emperor Manuel Comnenus (1143-80), was forced to recognize the autonomy of Cilician Armenia under Byzantine suzerainty. A Byzantine Viceroy or Imperial Duke, a new man each year, resided at Mopsuestia.

Nerses, in the lifetime of his brother Gregory III (1165), having come from Romgla to Mopsuestia on a mission of peace between two warring Armenian princes, had a conversation with the Viceroy and Emperor's son-in-law, the Duke Alexius. In reply to the latter's written inquiries, Nerses made the following statements regarding usages of the Armenian Church, viz.: (1) The muron or chrism is made from sesame instead of olive oil, owing solely to the scarcity of the latter in Armenia; (2) Armenians at different times have denounced pictures from motives of antagonism to the Greeks, but the Church does not itself endorse iconoclasm; (3) two-piece crosses, no others, are riveted together; (4) crosses are not annually consecrated as alleged, but washed and blessed following ancient Greek precedent, of which there is documentary proof; (5) the clause of the Trisagion, "who wast crucified for us," has reference to Christ, and not to the Trinity; (6) the unmixed cup has been the rule since the time of the Illuminator himself, nor is there in the gospels any mention of Christ at the Last Supper having mixed water with the wine; (7) on Saturdays and Sundays during the period of Lent, fish, olive oil

and eggs are prohibited, Greeks and Franks alone among us being permitted to indulge in them, while soldiers are allowed their own discretion; (8) the so-called Preliminary Fast preceding Lent was instituted by Gregory the Illuminator, and is sometimes called by the name of St. Sergius owing to his festival following immediately thereafter.

In consequence of these conversations the Emperor Manuel in 1170 sent the Philosopher Theorian to Romgla, accompanied by John Utman, Abbot of an Armenian Monastery at Philippopolis, as interpreter, to negotiate a union between the Greek and Armenian Churches. Negotiations were conducted behind closed doors, Nerses, now Catholicos (1167-73), deeming it politic to withhold them for the time being from the people. For a month the conversations dragged on, until the Greek was thoroughly satisfied of Nerses' orthodoxy, and set forth on his return trip, with three Arab steeds and three bows of Mosul as a gift from the Armenian prelate for his royal master, together with a personal letter which in part read as follows:

In keeping with the confession of the orthodox Fathers, we do anathematize all those confessing one nature in the Incarnate Word by fusion and mutation, all holding that he did not derive his human nature from our own lump and join it to his divinity, but created a special body of his own in the Virgin's womb, and all by similar reasonings confessing one nature in Christ, but not by an undivided and unconfused unity. We likewise anathematize all those dividing the one Christ into two natures, holding, like Nestorius, the deity distinct and the humanity distinct, the humanity passible and mortal, the divinity impassible and immortal, not attributing to the union both the passibility and the impassibility, both the death and the immortality. For we thus believe, that God the Word, begotten of the Father before all eternities, invisible, impassible, immortal, assumed of the Virgin our own nature in perfection, with it uniting his divine nature by an unconfused and an indivisible union, so that He who was invisible according to the deity became visible according to our humanity, the intangible became tangible,

and He who was impassible and immortal in his divine nature suffered and died in ours, not by a division, as though the one nature were passible and the other impassible, the one immortal and the other mortal, but He who suffered and died in his assumed human nature, the same in his divine nature being at the same time both impassible and immortal. For this reason also we speak of the blood of God, and of his passion and death, saying that God was crucified, which we by no means affirm of the divine nature as such, but of the ineffable union.

Pleased with the progress of these negotiations, the Emperor in 1172 sent Theorian and his interpreter back a second time to Romgla, instructing them to give certain counter demands of Nerses all due consideration. Theorian brought a letter, penned by the Patriarch Michael, in the Emperor's name. It said:

The confession of faith of Your Excellency written and forwarded to My Royal Person, I have read and found replete with wisdom and truth, not strange-sounding or strange-minded to the faith of our Holy Church, and the less so if we consider the intent as well as the content of truth therein set forth, although there be some few expressions which grate on the ear from their unwonted and unfamiliar roughness. After all, the doctrine and symbols of the Holy Ecumenical Fourth Council, and the Letter of Leo, great among saints, Archbishop of Rome, which Holy Church has pronounced, doth still pronounce, and never will cease to pronounce a pillar of the truth, together will clear up all doubts and uncertainties.

Nerses in the course of the second conference was much embarrassed to discover that it had been widely rumored at Constantinople that the Armenians were prepared to acquiesce in the doctrine of the "two natures." The conversations at times became heated, once relieved by a spontaneous outburst from the Greek preserved in his report to the Emperor: "Without doubt your nation pays strict heed to the letter of the Scriptures; believe me, neither do I say it only to be pleasant, you certainly are familiar with and well versed in the Holy Scriptures."

Theorian submitted to Nerses the following demands, viz.: (1)

To condemn all Monophysites; (2) to receive the two natures in the one person, undivided and unconfused; (3) to drop the clause "who wast crucified for us" from the Trisagion, and likewise the conjunction in "holy *and* mighty," which is absent in the Greek; (4) to adopt the Greek Church Calendar; (5) to celebrate the eucharist with leavened bread and mixed wine; (6) to make the chrism with olive oil; (7) to cause congregations to come into the churches instead of standing outside; (8) to receive the seven Ecumenical Councils, and, last of all, (9) to consent to the confirmation of the Catholicos by the Emperor.

The Catholicos inquired if the Emperor would be willing to forego any of his demands. Theorian asked him to name those he would have deleted. Nerses replied he did not know which ones the Synod, when convened, might find objectionable. "If you," said Theorian huffily, "who are the head of your Church, do not know, how am I to know who am not even the foot of my own?" But presently guessing at the objectionable demands, he added: "The point relating to the succession of the Catholicos seeks to conserve the dignity and security of yourself and your successors, and the perpetual establishment of your throne, by making the Holy Emperor your Protector, but in that particular matter it does not seem to me you would be placed under any constraint. Neither in the matter of unleavened bread is there likely to be compulsion, if you will only give your consent on other matters." Nerses replied: "If Satan, hater of men and deviser of evil, does not head off this great work, it shall not, the Lord helping, be frustrated by me. But it were not well either for ourselves or for you who are so anxious for a union, to stand unyielding upon every matter of detail. We should pass over some things, and discount others, that involve no prejudice to the faith, seeing that one's differing in matters of churchly usage does not of itself alienate him from the Christian faith itself."

Nerses was compelled to use diplomacy. He was not sure of his Bishops; he was being criticized. He prevailed on Theorian on a certain Sunday to address his people reassuringly. This the philosopher did. "Your Catholicos," he said, "has written to the Emperor nothing more than this: 'The union which Your Holy Majesty craves, the same also we desire and covet, and when by the Lord's

help we shall have convened our Synod, we will submit to it the proposals of Your Imperial Commissioners, and whatever God shall indicate as being for the best, that also will we then do, advising Your Majesty of the action taken by our Bishops.' ”

This personal assurance the Catholicos gave the Emperor through Theorian in writing: “The formula, ‘one nature,’ is true if rightly understood, but forasmuch as it has been a source of misunderstandings, we are willing to waive it.” Nerses himself seems to have been willing to concede all of the main points at issue, excepting the deletion of the Theopaschite clause of the Trisagion, that is, to discard the term ‘one nature,’ to receive the Council of Chalcedon, to mix water in the eucharistic wine, and to make holy ointment exclusively with olive oil. But by the government of his Church the final decision rested with his Synod of Bishops, whom to gather together would be a matter of months. Theorian having set out on his return journey to Constantinople, Nerses commenced writing to his Bishops the invitations to the proposed Synod. His health, however, already feeble, was now further impaired by the anxieties occasioned by Theorian’s visit, and very soon death intervened.

Theorian in the year following (1174) started for the third time for Romgla, to continue his parleys with Nerses’ successor, Gregory IV, but owing to an outbreak of hostilities between Manuel and the Sultan of Iconium, Kuludj Arslan, he returned to Constantinople. Gregory, however, was prevailed upon to call a Synod in 1179. There were present at this Synod, the Catholicos himself, together with that of the Albanians, and nine Archbishops, twenty-four Bishops, representing all sections of the Armenian dispersion, and a multitude of Abbots and Presbyters. The dominating personality and orator at this Synod was Nerses of Lambron, the twenty-six year old Archbishop of Tarsus, grand-nephew on the mother’s side, of the late Catholicos. Unlike his maternal grand-uncle, this Younger Nerses was proficient in Latin and Greek, and was, besides, a scholar and orator of no mean repute. His natural bent is revealed by the use he made of the 30,000 pounds (approximately \$100,000) left him by his father, the Count of Lambron. He gave one-third of this sum to the Church, one-third to the poor fund, and the remaining third he used for the

purchase and the copying of manuscripts. He himself was no mean penman, manuscripts from his hand to-day gracing Libraries of Paris and Rome.

Here we can only give a few excerpts from the Synodal oration of the youthful Archbishop. "We," said he, "neither avoid, nor yet fear any pollution from contact with, pagans; but, members though we be of each other, we do shun each other, and that for the most trivial opinions, as polluting. And of what sort, pray, is that other man's pollution? Scrutinize it if you will. It consists not in conduct or in acts, but in the confessing of Christ both God and Man! For though both sides hold to the same faith, yet must we needs esteem each the other as polluted by verbs and words! Woe unto us who shall appear before that impartial Judgment Seat in this partiality of hatred of ours, despising as we do the Law of Love!" That the difference between Monophysites and Diophysites is a mere matter of words, he proceeds thus to explain: "The divinity which we attribute to the one Christ they designate as nature, conveying thus the reality of that substance; and to the humanity which we attribute to him they again give the name of nature, so indicating the substance of the humanity. They believe implicitly in the unity over and above these, just as we do, having no reason, after an impartial scrutiny, for contradicting us here. For it is the same thing whether one says that Christ is both God and Man, or that he has two natures, with this difference only that the first expression definitely specifies the properties as well as the substance, while the second designates the substance without the properties. And it is quite patent that whosoever confesses Christ both God and Man, the same thereby posits two different natures in the one person."

Coming to rites and festivals, Nerses says: "Various signs have been given unto us of the outpouring of the grace of our Savior, such as the Holy Eucharist, the sanctifying Muron, the Dominical Holidays, and the rest. Now what purpose, think ye, can be served by diverging in the use of these things as to elements, or time, as the case may be, but, by stubbornly clinging to such divergencies, only to destroy the unity of peace of the Church of Christ? Why not take our Lord's own example for our guide, who, the Sabbath being made for man's rest, nevertheless deemed it right to break

it for the sake of a human being's own health? If we be not willing to do this, we are indeed fallen into Jewish fables! Brethren, let us beware lest the Word call hypocrites ourselves also who so destroy the Law of God to establish our own traditions!"

The vote being taken, the Synod pronounced upon the Greek demands as follows: (1) Eutyches always has been condemned by the Armenians, and Dioscurus likewise will be just so soon as it can be shown that he was of the same mind with the other; (2) the fact itself of the two natures in the one person always has been received; in order to prevent future misunderstandings, the terminology likewise is now accepted; (3) the conjunction in the Trisagion is merely a necessity of the Armenian meter, having no doctrinal significance; as to the charge of Theopaschitism, the very mention of the Cross should itself be accepted as a denial of that, but to remove all doubts the Synod offers to insert the clause, "wast incarnate and (crucified)"; (4) Christ does not increase or decrease by any changes made in the Calendar, but as the Armenian Calendar is hallowed by long usage, mutual patience and forbearance are asked in the adjusting of differences here; (5) if the Greeks will conform to Latin and Armenian usage in the matter of unleavened bread, the Armenians in their turn will conform to Greek and Latin usage in the matter of the mixed chalice; (6) the use among the Armenians of olive oil in the muron has been neglected owing solely to the scarcity of it, and the neglect will be remedied hereafter; (7) the practice of congregations standing outside the churches does not arise from choice, but as the Armenians, driven out of their own lands by alien invaders and excluded from Greek churches as heretics, have been unable to build in their new homes fast enough churches of their own, it first became a matter of necessity, and gradually of habit; (8) the Fourth Council having been shown to conform to the first three is accepted by the Synod, and the last three will likewise be accepted so soon as it shall be shown that they, too, thus conform; (9) the Synod gladly consents to the confirmation of the Catholicos by the Emperor.

The Synod made the following counter demands: (1) All serious offenders against the Church to be tried by canon law, and only restored after due process; (2) all light offenders to be

discriminated from the foregoing, and restored after due penance; (3) mutilated persons to be denied consecration to holy orders; (4) the bread of the communion to be unleavened; (5) the burying of surplus communion bread in the ground and the mixing of leftover eucharistic wine with hot water to be discontinued; (6) priests to be forbidden during canonical fasts the use of fish and wine.

We have gone thus in some detail into the acts of this Synod for the reason that they form a record of the position taken by a considerable portion of the Armenian clergy of the time with reference to the long-drawn-out controversies with the Greeks. The Synod, too, helped to create a considerable Chalcedonist party within the Armenian Church, so much so that a hundred years afterward it could properly be said that Chalcedonism was sweeping over Armenia and Georgia like a flood. Throughout the Church at large, however, there was from the beginning an overwhelming opposition to the Synod, and as both Emperor and Patriarch (Greek) died, the latter shortly before, and the former shortly after the Synod, nothing more came of it. In fact already Cilician Armenia was beginning to look to the Papacy, rather than to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, in shaping its national policies.

Not that all hope even yet was completely abandoned for the reunion of the two churches. In 1196 Alexius III, Angelus, bestowed upon Leo II of Cilicia a royal crown. In the ensuing year an Armenian delegation reached Constantinople, headed by the Archbishop of Tarsus, Nerses, older and wiser now by nearly two decades. However, he returned home crestfallen, declaring that he had found the Greeks "coarse of speech, bound to things material after the fashion of the Jews, and delighting to serve God not in the newness of the spirit, but in the oldness of the letter."

CHAPTER XII

PAPAL INTRIGUES

SALADIN the Kurd, in 1187, captured Jerusalem, and in 1189 Frederick I, Barbarossa, entered upon the Third Crusade. Arrived at Iconium, Frederick sent word to Leo, Prince of Cilician Armenia, offering him a royal crown in return for help against Saladin. The Prince himself, the Catholicos Gregory IV, and Nerses of Lambron, set out for Isauria to meet the Emperor, when they learned the latter had lost his life bathing in the Calycadnus (1190).

The Pope Gains a Foothold

It devolved upon Frederick's son and successor, Henry VI, later to carry out the father's promise. On the Armenian Christmas, January 6, 1198, in the Cathedral Church of Tarsus, Leo, second Prince, and First King, of that name, was anointed by the Catholicos King of Cilicia, and crowned by Conrad, Archbishop of Mainz, with a crown conveying the good wishes of the Emperor and of Pope Celestine III. Not to be outdone by the Latins, the Byzantine Emperor, Alexius III, Angelus, in the following year likewise recognized Leo's advanced status by sending him a royal crown.

In acknowledging at this time the Pope's favors, the Catholicos, Gregory IV, wrote to him as follows: "All the archbishops, bishops and priests of the Church of our land (and by the grace of God there are many of them) are confirmed in office according to Your Command. We beg of You to pray the Lord for us who are in the very mouth of the Dragon, in the midst of enemies of the Cross and of ourselves." This letter, Celestine having died, was received by his successor, Innocent III, who replied repeating the myth that "the Church of Armenia from the beginning had received the faith from the Romans," and exhorting Gregory "to continue steadfast in loyalty to the Apostolic Throne, and to confirm the King and the entire Church of Armenia in the Law of the Lord and in their love of Us (as already we have instructed by

previous epistles of ours), extending to them the Apostolical Indulgences."

Once Pope Lucius III (1181-85) having sent Gregory IV a mitre and pallium, Pope Innocent III also now sent Gregory's successor, the Catholicos John VI (1203-21) the episcopal pallium (1205). This was in the year following the capture of Constantinople by the Latins. In acknowledgment of the advances of the Pope the Catholicos and King signed with the papal Legate, the Cardinal Peter Marcella, a tripartite contract by the terms of which the Armenians promised to send to Rome a Delegate every five years in assurance of loyalty to the High Pontiff. The Catholicos himself promised to take a part, either personally or by proxy, in every Synod called by the Pope in the East, non-representation of the Armenians at such synod *ipso-facto* annulling it. On his part the Pope agreed to have the King, his dominions and subjects under his own direct spiritual jurisdiction, exempt from ban or interdict of any subordinate Roman prelate.

Tentative Steps toward Reunion

During the reign of the Catholicos Constantine I (1221-67) the relations of Cilician Armenia with the Papal See continued cordial. Following the precedent set by his predecessors, about 1234, Constantine begged for the pallium from Pope Gregory IX, who readily granted it, "seeing that the pallium bestowed by the Apostolic See upon Thy predecessors must be worn with age." This Pope in 1238 issued orders for the Armenian "Patriarch" to be subordinated to the Latin Bishop of Antioch. It appears that the so-called *Compact of St. Gregory with Pope Sylvester* was forged by some Armenian or other at this time. So far does this document, by establishing the previous pontifical allegiance of the Armenian Church, seem to have flattered the vanity of the Pope that in the following year he promptly rescinded his former order. In 1243 an unofficial Synod at Sis, acceding to a request from the Pope, condemned the Armenians' neglect of extreme unction, and provided that the Trisagion should not be recited in such a way that the clause, "who wast crucified for us," would seem to apply to the Holy Trinity.

Five years later (1248) the Pope's Legate brought to the

Catholicos a document criticizing Armenian doctrine and usage, and intended as a basis of union. Unacceptable to the Armenians were fifteen points in it as enumerated by the Catholicos in a memorandum submitted to the King, Hetum (Hayton) I (1226-70), viz.: (1) Rome claims sole right to bind and to loose; (2) the Spirit proceeds from the Father and from the Son; (3) the Man Christ has two natures; (4) souls of men are created at each birth; (5) Mary is Virgin, but not Mother-of-God; (6) the Word was made co-equal with the Father; (7) as Man he is less than the Father; (8) Christ has two natures and two wills; (9) He delivered from hell the righteous only; (10) subsequent to the Resurrection our Lord's Body was further glorified; (11) a priest is authorized to baptize, but only a Bishop may anoint with the chrism; (12) the consecration of the chrism is omitted from the sevenfold priestly functions; (13) third and fourth marriages are lawful; (14) the righteous dead are rewarded before the Day of Judgment, and only the unrepentant go to purgatory; (15) those with the holy angels, and those in purgatory, are equally glorified. The memorandum questions the sincerity of the Papal interest in Armenia and the Armenians: "There are in Armenia beginning at Erznga and beyond 620 cantons, and of these some are in ruins and some in bondage. If really they care for the Armenians, let them go and deliver them!" For all that, in 1251, Constantine convened another Synod, and there the double procession of the Spirit nominally was acceded to. This Synod, however, was promptly rejected by the Bishops of Upper Armenia, where its decisions provoked much adverse criticism. The advances of the Pope at this time to the Greeks, Georgians and Syrians were entirely ignored.

The Moslem Menace

There seemed more hope at this time in a Tatar entente. Hetum accordingly went in person on a mission to Mangu Khan, at Karakorum, in 1254 (about the time the traveller Marco Polo was born), taking with him six ecclesiastics and a numerous retinue of nobles. It appears that he travelled in conveyances furnished by the Great Khan. He was presented to Mangu on September 13 of that year, and was at the Mongol Court fifty days, securing a

promise of protection for the Armenian provinces and churches. Hetum's good standing with the Khan was further confirmed in 1256 when Baiju invading the Sultanate of Iconium, Hetum helped him with men and stores, and was therefore favorably mentioned by him to his superior General, afterward Khan, Hulagu.

Hetum was absent from his kingdom on a western Tatar mission when an Egyptian army reduced Sis and burned its Cathedral, and having killed in battle one of the King's two sons, Toros, carried the other off into captivity, together with 40,000 prisoners of war, and the buried royal treasure of six million dinars (1266). Hetum in 1270 took the cowl, retiring to the Monastery of Agner as Brother Macarius, and dying in the same year. In that same year also died St. Louis, King of France, at the siege of Tunis, thus ending the Eighth and last Crusade. In this reign or early in the next the German Burchard of Mt. Sion visited Cilicia and the East. We shall speak of him again. By 1275 Sis once more was a rejuvenated city, but in that year the Sultan of Egypt, Bibars (Fundukdar), invaded the land and laid waste its towns. In 1279, however, Leo III (1270-89), brother of Toros, was defending the fortress of Romgla, seat of the Catholicos, against his late captors. Not until 1282 was an Armeno-Egyptian peace signed.

Negotiations: Hetum II

The Moslem menace made it quite plain that, for all its late loss of prestige the Papacy as a possible ally was not to be entirely relinquished. At this time the Armenian royal family became increasingly entangled with the Latins in blood and belief. Leo's second son, Toros, married Marguerite, daughter of Hugo III, King of Cyprus (1286). His eldest son, Hetum, on his father's death ascended the throne as Hetum II (1289-97), though falling in with Franciscan monks, he never wore a crown or married a queen. One of his first acts upon accession was to dispatch a member of that order to Pope Nicholas IV to tender to him his liege loyalty. Whereupon the Pope addressed to the King a letter, commending him for his praiseworthy desire to enter the Roman fold, admonishing him to remain firm in the resolve, and urging him to prevail upon his bishops to accept likewise the true doc-

trine. In like vein the Pope wrote also to members of the royal family and to dignitaries of state. The papal letters occasioned lively controversies, most of all in the monasteries. Neither were the two heads, political and ecclesiastical, of the nation, agreed. The Catholicos Constantine II (1286-89) was deposed by a rump synod, placed under arrest, and, lest he should flee to Upper Armenia transferring the Holy See thither, immured in the Fortress of Lambron. Stephen IV (1290-93) was proclaimed high pontiff, while the King and the Bishop of Anazarbus directed affairs at Sis.

A special royal edict in 1292 called upon all Armenians of Cilicia to celebrate Easter with the Latins on the 6th of April, without regard to that periodic deviation of their Calendar which made it fall again that year on the Sunday following. Those refusing to conform to the royal mandate were beaten with rods, and some were banished.

In that same year Romgla fell to the Egyptians, Stephen IV, the Catholicos, with twelve of his Bishops, many priests and deacons, being taken captives. Melik Ashraf returned in haste to Egypt to repel a new Crusade, taking the Catholicos in chains with him. In the following year Stephen died in prison. Hetum surrendered to the Egyptians Marash, Behesna and Hamtun, by way of compensation, or as we should say as a sop, receiving St. Gregory's and some other relics previously carried off. With the consecration of the Bishop of Anazarbus in 1293 as Gregory VII, the Catholicate was transferred to Sis.

As might have been expected, Gregory took the matter of the Latinizing of his Church in hand in good earnest, thereby gaining for himself the sobriquets of "the Roman," and "the Diluter" (of the eucharistic wine). The diluting, he confessed, was done clandestinely, to avoid the papal anathema threatening all who did not practise it. He aspired to introduce by degrees the following concessions to Latin prejudice, viz.: To accept the seven ecumenical councils; to adopt the formula of the two natures, wills and operations; to celebrate Christmas on December 25; to prohibit the use of milk on Easter Eve; to observe the Friday fasts of the Fifty Days after Easter; to observe with the Latins all Dominical and saints' days and fasts, and cancel the Armenian weekly sys-

tem; to delete from the Trisagion the words, "who wast crucified," or insert "Christ" before them; to introduce the use of canonical vestments; to conduct all church services within church buildings; to adopt the Latin system for clerical ordinations (the *quatuor tempora*); to use images like those of the Latins without discrimination as to consecration, and to authorize the mixing of water with the wine of the chalice.

Hetum who meanwhile had retired to a monastery of the Franciscan order under the name of Brother John, had not thereby renounced all active interest in the government of the country. Ghazan Khan, whom he had gone to see while the latter was still fighting for his throne, he again visited in 1295 to felicitate him on his accession at Tabriz and once more assure himself of his friendship. Hetum in 1298 was on a mission to Constantinople with his brother Toros, when Smbat, the next younger brother, having seized the government, had himself crowned King in St. Sophia of Sis. Smbat in turn now went to see Ghazan Khan, was by him confirmed on the throne of Cilicia, married a woman of the Persian royal family, and seizing his brothers as they returned with heavy funds from the Emperor Andronicus, in the vicinity of Cesarea, cast them into a fortress of the Taurus, later putting Toros to death and blinding Hetum, acts in which he had the support of his nobles, and apparently of the Catholicos.

Smbat (1297-98), however, was not long left in undisputed possession of the throne. Constantine, Count of Gaban (Geben), fourth son of Leo III, attacked him with a good-sized force, captured him while fleeing toward Greek territory, and incarcerated him. But Constantine in his turn ruled for but a short time only (1298-99). Hetum recovered his sight, and seizing once more the reins of government, banished both Smbat and Constantine to the Byzantine capital. After which joining forces with the Tatars of Ghazan Khan he drove the Egyptians from the Syrian coast towns back as far as Jerusalem. This done, he again retired from the helm of government, placing on the throne his own deceased brother Toros' son, Leo, a lad of but twelve years, who was officially crowned at the opening of the year 1301. In 1304 we see Hetum again undertaking a mission to Tabriz to pay his respects to Ghazan's successor Uljaitu. Meanwhile, the Tatars having

abolished the Seljukian Sultanate of Iconium (1294), there rises to the Turkish succession, at the other end of Asia Minor, the Ottoman dynasty (1299).

Gregory VII died without seeing the Synod he had hoped to call to settle once for all matters in dispute with Rome. The summons for a Synod to elect a new Catholicos was issued by King Leo IV (1301-07), now eighteen years of age. The roll of Bishops present at this Synod, twenty-six in all, is instructive as indicating the geography of the Armenian dispersion of the early fourteenth century. The list includes six leading Bishops of Cilicia (Sis, Tarsus, Anazarbus, Adana, Gaban and Marash), two of Syria (Aleppo and Mufarkin), three of Asia Minor (Cesarea, Niksar and Amasea), eight of Upper Armenia (Baiburt, Pasen, Erznga, Keghi, Kemakh, Chemshgazak, Jabaghchur and Sasun), and one each of Constantinople and Salonica. The Synod met in the spring of 1307. The demands of Rome were put first on the docket. The King, advised by the Regent, Hetum, submitted an outline basis of union, and asked the Lord Bishops to sign on the dotted line. They did. Four days later they reconvened to elect a new Catholicos. The choice fell on Constantine III (1307-22), dubbed "the Schismatic." Upon him devolved the carrying out of the decisions of Sis, conforming entirely with the aforementioned designs of Gregory VII.

Fishing in Troubled Waters

Instigated by the fiery nobles, Bilarghu, commander of a Tatar contingent at the Fortress of Anazarbus, in the fall invited the eighteen-year-old King and Regent, with forty of their suite to a conference, and treacherously put them to the sword. Oshin, however, brother to the late regent, came out from Gaban, rallied the Cilician forces at Sis, and drove the Tatar from the land, and seized the throne. Bilarghu's action was not sustained by Uljaitu Khan, who granted an audience to the new King's twin brother Alinakh at Sultanieh (1308). Oshin (1308-20) pursued his predecessors' pro-Latin policies, finding in the Catholicos a warm supporter. As a consequence there was a popular uprising in 1308 at Adana, and in the following year at Sis. At the capital the military had to be called out to suppress the tumult; men and women

were killed. Many of the clergy were put to death or died of their injuries; many were imprisoned or banished to Cyprus, the domain of Amaury de Lusignan, Oshin's brother-in-law. Oshin sent repeated emissaries to Pope Clement V, and to King Edward II, of England, seeking aid, and receiving from the first a half dozen Franciscan monks, and from the second heartening letters! Nor was Oshin alone or even first seeking renewed western alliances. Uljaitu himself had addressed letters to Philip the Fair, of France, and to King Edward I, of England, desiring military aid against Melik al Nasir, of Egypt.

The net result of the Synod of 1307 was the secession of the Armenian Bishop of Jerusalem, Sergius, who secured in 1311 from the Sultan of Egypt the standing of an independent Patriarch. But Oshin, nothing daunted, his troubles at home having subsided, journeyed in person to Upper Armenia to convince and conciliate the clergy there. The place of meeting was Bitlis, the date between 1311 and 1313. He had no success. A monarch of decidedly Latin sympathies, Oshin kept at his court six Latin Franciscan monks, upon the death of his first wife married a daughter of the royal house of Sicily, appealed to the Pope to settle a quarrel between himself and the King of Cyprus, and implored the Supreme Pontiff to raise another Crusade.

Pope John XXII (1316-34) upon his accession urged King and Catholicos to convene a lawful Synod to ratify the decisions of 1307. A Synod accordingly was called in 1317 at Adana, the new capital, in the St. Menas Chapel of the Royal Palace. The Catholicos Constantine III was present, with royalty, together with seventeen Bishops, of whom ten were of Cilicia, two abbots, and a multitude of monks and lay priests. And once more it was decided to dilute the eucharistic wine, to observe Christmas and Epiphany separately, and to endorse the two natures and wills. After a lengthy defence of the positions taken, the Synod declared: "Wherefore, by way of reaffirming previous deliverances and ordinances, adopted at the great Synod of Sis, We, also, Bishops, Doctors, and Fathers here assembled, do ordain that the rulings of the previous Synod are to be respected as acts both evangelical and apostolical, and all its canons and dominical holidays observed with faultless precision in all Armenian churches. Those who

shall be found opposing our decisions and rulings, and those of the previous Synod, be they clerics or laymen, we do, by divine authority disown and cast out from the Catholic and Apostolic Holy Church of Rome, expelling them from our flock and fold until they shall come to repentance. Let no one therefore oppose us or the truth as upheld in our rulings, lest he lay himself open to the judgment and penalties of Christ our Lord both here and in the hereafter."

Following this Synod King Oshin dispatched an embassy to the Pope, advising His Holiness of the actions taken, and of conditions in his kingdom generally. The Pope, after a thorough examination of the Bishop of Gaban, who headed the delegation, pronounced him in every way orthodox, except for two irregularities, namely, the administration of confirmation, and the consecrating of the oil of extreme unction, both, by a priest, instead of a bishop! The High Pontiff asked the King to designate, near the seaport town of Ayas, where was a large Latin colony, a proper site for the erection of a Dominican school where Armenian youths could be taught the Latin tongue, arts and sciences, and Theology.

The temporal perils of Armenia now were as ever more clamorous than its spiritual. In 1318 the Turks of Karaman raided Cilicia as far as Tarsus, and in the following year again the Egyptians laid waste the land as far as Sis. Meanwhile the Pope sought to make peace between Cilicia and Cyprus, the two last remaining Christian states in the Levant. In 1322 he called on all Christendom to pray for the Armenians, to whose aid in the following year an appeal from him to Abu Said Khan brought 20,000 Tatar troops.

Early Missions

In this period belong the beginnings of the Papacy's Armenian Mission, which, while representing a better method of approach, yet also brought with it its own occasions for intrigue. To see those beginnings we must turn to Persia, and its then capital of Sultanieh, where the Dominicans established their headquarters. About the year 1317 the Dominican, Bartholomew of Bologna,

founded a monastery at Maragha. The enterprise originally contemplated the preaching of Christianity to Moslems.

Bartholomew was a scientist and astronomer, and had for a companion a young Franciscan monk, Peter of Aragona (in Sicily), who was a linguist. In 1328 Esaias, Abbot of a Monastery near Erivan, who enjoyed considerable repute as a teacher in Greater Armenia, sent word to one of his former pupils, John of Carni, to go and see Bartholomew and bring him word of the latter's doctrine. John sojourned at Maragha a year and a half, learning Latin from Bartholomew, and teaching him and his companions Armenian. Finally he proposed to Bartholomew the founding of a Brotherhood Monastery in his own native town of Carni, to be financed by an uncle. The project appealed to Bartholomew, and accordingly the said uncle, George, who was town chief of Carni, there built within sixty days and at his own expense a Church and Monastery for his nephew and associates, of whom we know twelve by name (1330).

Bartholomew now was advanced to the post of Archbishop of Nakhichevan, and made the head of a newly organized order which he called "Unitors," in that he expected them to bend every effort to "unite" the Armenian Church to the Church of Rome. The order was a fraternity of preaching Dominicans, obeying the rule of St. Augustine. They also engaged in translation, rendering Latin works and ritual books into a crude Latinized Armenian. Soon they turned into an order of fanatics whose bounden duty as conceived was to destroy all Armenian doctrinal and ritual non-conformity, and quite naturally they stirred up strenuous opposition. King Leo V (1320-42), of Cilicia, ordered them arrested and jailed as disturbers of the peace, whenever they trespassed on his own domains. They retaliated by accusing the King of causing divisions among his people, and prevailed on His Holiness to withhold for a time the 30,000 pounds previously promised for reconstruction work in Cilicia, mostly at Ayas.

The immediate oversight of the Unitors later was committed to John the Englishman, assistant to Bartholomew and Bishop of Tiflis. In this John's presence, and in the Latin rite, all Armenian Unitors took their oath of allegiance to John of Carni as provincial leader. The latter, on entering upon his office, issued an encyclical

in which he enumerated so many as nineteen errors of the Armenians, among them being the one-nature doctrine, the single procession, the denial of purgatory, the admission of but five sacraments (confirmation and extreme unction being omitted), and the unmixed chalice, together with the demurrer to the supremacy of the Pope. The Unitors soon claimed a following of three cities and thirty villages, and went so far as to rebaptize and reordain their converts.

Upon Bartholomew's death (1333), his followers threw off all restraints. John of Carni in 1334 repaired to Rome to secure the Pope's sanction for the organization of a Dominican order of Unitors. The order once organized proceeded to erect monasteries at Maragha, Nakhichevan, Sultanieh, Tiflis, Theodosia (Crimea), and elsewhere. By bull of Pope Innocent VI the order in 1356 was merged into that of the Dominicans, having a Bishop at Nakhichevan to shepherd its lay constituency. They had in the time of the Catholicos Mesrop I (1359-72) about a hundred monks in seven monasteries. Notable among the Unitor clergy were the Uniat Bishops of Erzurum and Urmia.

The Uniat Bishop of Urmia, Nerses Balienz, was a native of Sis. Thinking to find the Catholicos Mekhitar I (1341-55), creature of the Latinized King Leo V, sympathetic, he came to Cilicia only to be excommunicated. He repaired thereupon to Avignon, the Court of Pope Benedict XII, who already had received a letter of complaint from Simeon, Uniat Bishop of Erzurum, now a refugee in Cyprus. Nerses was supported also by certain of his brotherhood who had preceded him to Avignon, besides some Latins, all of whom together helped him compile a book of Armenian errors, 117 of them, which was presented to the Pope. At this juncture a messenger arriving from the Armenian King to beg for aid against the infidels received no encouraging reply: "We can do nothing for you at all, as you seem steeped in too many errors" (1341)! It devolved on the Catholicos Mekhitar to call together a Synod to answer charges and reassure the Pope, which was done as soon as the latest Egyptian invasion would permit (1342). While extreme and puerile charges were earnestly repudiated, the Armenian reply did not depart from candor. The orthodox Armenians "following ancient usage employ no water

in the eucharist, observe the festivals of Christmas and Epiphany together on the 6th of January, confess Christ perfect God and perfect Man, but say, because of the ineffable union, 'One Nature,' following the teaching of Cyril, 'one is the nature of the Incarnate Word,' reject in keeping with this to this day the Council of Chalcedon, had not until fifty years ago so much as heard the name of purgatory, and do not acknowledge the primacy of the Church of Rome." For all that the Synod was willing to depart from "orthodoxy" and turn "catholic." The Lord Bishops may have but little realized that the Pope's own embarrassments then were as great and as numerous as their own. And already the Popes' Seventy Years' Captivity, and the hundred years' war between England and France (1337-1453) were being overshadowed by the Black Death that commenced now periodically to overrun Europe.

Downfall of Cilicia

In 1335, Nasir Mohammed, Sultan of Egypt, invaded Cilicia, ravaging Mopsuestia, Adana and Tarsus, and slaughtering the rural population. Leo V was forced to surrender the Fortress of Ayas, the entire province of Marash, and the canton of Jahan, and to promise on oath to have no further correspondence with the Pope, a pledge from which, however, Pope Benedict XII by a special dispensation shortly released him (1338). Leo died in 1342, at the early age of thirty-three years. Upon his decease the Cyprian French House of Lusignan inherited the throne of Cilician Armenia.

Pope Clement VI received the reply of the Synod of Sis when Guy de Lusignan already was on the Cilician throne as Constantine II. He was a nephew of the King of Cyprus, son of a Latin father and an Armenian mother. He made the rash attempt to convert his people to Rome by a strong royal edict. The soldiery rose up and slew him in Adana with about 300 of his Latin retainers (1344). In this uprising a priest also saying mass in the Latin rite lost his life. All of which naturally did not serve to conciliate the Pope or bring church union any the nearer. The Pope's promises for military and financial aid were not renewed

until 1347. In 1351 Clement VI was still demanding reliable assurance of Armenian orthodoxy.

Soon (1356) there was another Egyptian raid. In 1360, the Black Death having devastated Cilicia with special virulence in the previous year, the Egyptian provincial governor of Aleppo, Beg Timur, captured Tarsus and Adana. In the year following the Fortress of Corycus, on the coast, was transferred to the suzerainty of the King of Cyprus. But the religious controversies raged still unabated. To reassure the populace, a Synod was convened at Sis, now again the capital (1361), and the use of water in the eucharistic wine together with all other "innovations" abrogated. But already the Kingdom of Cilicia had dwindled to the small territory around the capital. To make the desolation complete, King Constantine III (1344-63) died heirless, his children having been carried off by the plague.

In 1365 Peter I, King of Cyprus, took and plundered Alexandria. The Egyptians retaliated on the Christians of Egypt and Syria. Constantine IV, of Cilicia (1365-73), while contemplating making terms with the Egyptians and retiring to Cyprus, was assassinated. Leo VI, his successor, reached Corycus on Easter Sunday, 1374, both Corycus and Cyprus being now in the hands of the Genoese. It was an eight days' journey to Sis, and the intervening territory was occupied by the Emir of Tarsus. Leo, however, made a dash for the capital, reaching it safely with twenty-five horsemen, and was crowned in the Cathedral Church of St. Sophia as Defender of the Catholic Faith, by the Latin Bishop of Cyprus, on September 14. Seven months later he surrendered the city to the Moslem, the Emir Melik of Aleppo, who upon summons of the Sultan Shaban Ashref took him with his family and entourage to Cairo, there to be kept a prisoner at large until 1382. Leo died in France (1393), and was buried in the royal crypts of the Abbey, in St. Denis, north of Paris, where the tombstone marking his last resting place is still to be seen.

Conditions in the Mother Country

Thus ended the Kingdom of Cilician Armenia, but not the troubles of Armenia. In 1370 Timur the Tatar, commonly known as Tamerlane, became Great Khan. In 1380 his armies broke

into the Atropatene and Armenia, penetrating as far as Van and Kars. They came again in 1386, and in 1387, retiring each winter to the steppes of Mugan, where the climate was milder and fire-wood more plentiful, leaving behind them devastation and famine (1387-89). In 1397, having employed the interim invading Russia and the Crimea, Timur marched again with his men through Armenia and the Atropatene to India, whence in 1399 he returned, and after capturing Amida (Diarbekir) and Merdin, advanced as far as Erznga. In 1400 he took Aleppo and Damascus, and in the beginning of the following year sacked Sis. In 1402 he invested Sivas, then in the Ottoman dominions, and defeated and captured Sultan Bayezid at Angora. At this time occurred the last great exodus of Armenians from Cilicia (1404). The Tatar conqueror himself died in Turkestan in 1405.

With these times are linked the later fortunes of the Unitors. Their work prospered especially in the region of Nakhichevan. Their diocesan Bishop resided near that city, at Abaran. They were persecuted, and if in revenge they maligned their persecutors at the Vatican, they but brought upon themselves further abuse. As traitors to their race and country, they were delivered up to Moslem governors, beaten with rods, made to walk on red hot copper plates, cast into boiling water. Such things occurred on the eve of Timur's invasions. For three hundred years the Papists held their own, but in the days of Chardin (1673) twenty of their villages already had returned to the mother Church, while the inhabitants of the remaining eight daily dropped off under oppressions of Persian governors whose ill-will had been invited by an attempt of the Pope to withdraw them from their civil jurisdiction. When in 1830 Smith and Dwight were in this region, the Dominican missions were no more. Abaran and two other villages had held out until almost the time of the Americans' visit, but now they, too, showed only empty churches. The missionaries were assured by the Gregorian Bishop of Datev that the inhabitants had emigrated, and that some of them or their descendants were then at Smyrna.²⁸

The Council of Florence and Since

That the Armenians had lost their place and kingdom led to no relaxing of effort on the Pope's part to bind them ever closer to his throne. The Byzantine Empire was tottering to its fall, when Pope Eugenius IV invited the Emperor, John VI, Palaeologus, and the Patriarch, Joseph, of Constantinople, to a Council to consider the matter of the reunion of their churches. The Council, convened first (1433) at Basel, later (1438) transferred to Ferrara, adjourned finally (1439) to meet at Florence. From the beginning the Armenians had been invited, through two of their bishops at Constantinople, to send delegates. As however they delayed so doing, in 1438 Papal emissaries went down from Poland to Theodosia (Kafa), then under Genoese rule, and having a large colony of Romanized Armenians, and from that point, the Emperor's Consul assisting, got into direct touch with the Catholicos of Sis, the latter, Constantine VI (1430-39) appointing to represent him at the Council Joachim, Bishop of Aleppo, a certain Doctor Sergius, pastor at Theodosia, and two other Doctors. The delegation arrived at Florence August 25, 1439, when the Council had been already two months adjourned, and the Greek delegates were at the point of departure after having given in their consent to the double procession, the doctrine of purgatory, and the supremacy of the Pope. Three months later, November 22, 1439, Eugenius IV issued a Bull, *Exultate Deo*, in which he declared that the Armenian Church, for 900 years isolated, was now re-united with the Church of Rome. Constantine VI meanwhile having died, the delegation left Florence in December, returning not to Sis, but to Kafa. Neither was the so-called "union" ever ratified by any Armenian Synod.

Not that Armenian Catholici always since have remained aloof from Rome. Messengers of goodwill, with professions of orthodoxy and perhaps even of loyalty, were dispatched to the Popes as frequently as occasion seemed to demand. Such professions of course were not intended to be taken very seriously. Nor were they. It was more to the purpose that the Popes took a growing interest in the education of Armenian youth for the Roman priesthood. The craving for knowledge must have lost many a youth of the Armenian communion to the Church of Rome.

Pope Gregory XIII, author of the Gregorian Calendar, in 1584 issued a Bull authorizing a College in Rome for the training of Armenian youths. In the following year, however, Gregory died, and for lack of funds the project lapsed. Forty years later, about 1625, during the reign of Pope Urban VIII, Paul of Boulogne, then Bishop of the Diocese of Nakhichevan, raised in India and in America a considerable sum of money for such a College. Dying on his return journey in Spain, he left by a will the funds collected for the intended purpose. In the meantime the College of the Propaganda, in Rome, founded in 1627, took over the responsibility for the training of Armenian candidates for holy orders. This obligation it still discharges. Leo XIII, in 1883, assigned the Church of St. Nicholas Tolentine, with the adjoining Monastery, in Rome, to remain in perpetuity under the jurisdiction of the College of the Propaganda, for a special headquarters for Armenian students, there to live, and conduct services in their own language.

CHAPTER XIII

THE LATER DEVOTIONAL WRITERS

THE Armenian Church's devotional writers by way of eminence are of the Middle Ages, or what is known as the Silver Age of Armenian literature, namely, Gregory of Nareg, and the Catholicos Nerses the Graceful.

Gregory of Nareg

The *Book of Lamentations*, commonly called *Nareg*, was written in the Convent of that name, on the south shores of Lake Van, by a monk named Gregory, at the beginning of the eleventh century (1002), during a period of history when the successes of the Emperor Basil II against the Saracens were to restore in the country an evanescent Byzantine ascendancy. A prayer-book, it consists mainly of meditations and petitions of penitence and aspiration.

The book occupies in Armenian Church literature a place somewhat akin to that of à Kempis' *Imitation of Christ* in western Europe. But, being more distinctly doctrinal and penitential than the fifteenth century Dutch book, it has points of resemblance also to Augustine's *Confessions*. Augustine is primarily autobiographical, and à Kempis hortatory. Gregory is devotional. Augustine's well-known book is one of confessions and prayers, the *Imitation* of counsels and prayers, the *Book of Nareg* of studies and prayers. The *Confessions*, while emphasizing renunciation, at the same time throb with life; the *Book of Nareg*, like the *Imitation*, breathes the air of the monastery, stressing renunciation as an end in itself rather than as a preparation for adventuring for God. It is written primarily for monks: "Behold I say unto you, ye congregations of ascetics, and ye candidates in monasteries, who with your bare hands have enlisted in the Lord's army with hope and expectation of gifts of infinite good, before whom I have spread this table of the dainties of the Word, receive ye this word of confession to the edifying and saving of your souls."

The devotional style of the book will appear as we now proceed

to examine the doctrinal content constituting to us its main interest.

The theology of *Nareg* is Augustinian. Like Augustine and Paul, Gregory would shut all up under sin. "Know ye by this the unprofitableness of the flesh; remember the prophetic and apostolic word given for our admonition, 'Let no flesh glory before God,' and 'There is none righteous, no, not one.'" If you would escape judgment, seek deliverance from sin: "Dash out the lees of the insensate unrighteousness of my cup of death, by thy saving command, thou Savior of all, that I may not drain on that last Day the cup of thy wrath."

Gregory's hope is in the mercy of God. "Reward me not according to my evil deeds." "I have no courage to extend toward Thee my sinful hands of flesh, until Thou extend to me Thine own blessed right hand to the renewing of me condemned." Neither does he hope in vain. "But if the Father pitiful, heavenly, mighty, gave up for the sins of me who lay under a condemnation One who was of his own very being, Only-Begotten of his inscrutable bosom, not sparing Thee, the Son, co-equal with himself in honor, and well-beloved, yea, gave willingly unto the death prepared by them who tormented Thee with instruments of death, according to the prophecy of Zecharias who speaks of the sword arising upon the Shepherd and smiting the Leader of the flock, the sheep of the flock being scattered abroad (antitype of an earlier fine original, to be found in the covenant of the altar, with the presenting of the blood of the victim, and in the parable of the mystery of the Abrahamic sacrifice prefiguring the salvation of me, the miserable one, by the will of the Giver of Life), why, O my soul, now be sad, ruined as thou art, not by design of God but solely by thine own inclination, and why disturb me with despair, smiting my spirit with demonic thoughts? Hope thou in God, confess to him, and he will care for thee, even according to the Davidic psalm, and the heartening word of that other prophet."

All the springs of Gregory's comfort are in God. "For Thine is the salvation, and from Thee is cleansing, and from Thy right hand is the renewing, and by Thy finger is power, and from Thy commands is righteousness, and from Thy mercies freedom, and from Thy face is light, and from Thy presence is pleasure, and

by Thy Spirit is goodness, and by the anointing of Thine oil is healing, and by the sprinkling of Thy grace is joy, and Thou art the One who givest comfort, and causest to forget despair, and liftest off the darkness of sorrows, and turnest the crying of lamentation into rejoicing."

Gregory's God is an able God. "If Thou wilt, Thou canst; nay rather Thou wilt just as Thou canst." God wills it and man is saved. "Do Thou will it, Lord, and I shall be saved; regard me only in pity, and I shall be justified; speak the word, and forthwith I shall be spotless; forget the number of my sins, and instantly I shall receive courage; deal generously with me, and behold I shall be grafted on Thee, Thou ever All-Blessed One." That God himself may not offhand will man's salvation, but must needs do something before he can save, enters not Gregory's thought. He has no doctrine of a divine Atonement. He sees the tragedy of the Cross, and Christ as the divine Martyr, and there he stops. "They carried Thee out as a whole burnt offering, they hung Thee up as the Ram in the Thicket caught by the horns, they spread Thee on the altar of the Cross as a sacrifice, they nailed Thee to it as a malefactor, bound Thee as a rebel, Thee the peace of heaven as a thief, Thee in greatness irreducible as a victim, Thee whom the cherubim worship as one despised, Thee the beginning and the end of life as one worthy of a felon's death, Thee the author of the gospel as a blasphemer of the law, Thee the Lord and fulfiller of the prophets as an abbreviator of the scriptures, Thee the ray of glory and seal of the Father's inscrutable thought as an enemy of the Father's will, Thee in very truth blessed as one banished from God, Thee the looser of the bonds of the law as a man under a curse, Thee the consuming fire as a prisoner condemned, Thee who art terrible to heaven and earth as a veritable convict, Thee who art clothed with light unapproachable as one of the earthborn."

Our writer, however, is a Calvinist before Calvin. "If we flee from Thee, Thou pursuest us; if we weaken, Thou dost make us strong; if we err, Thou showest an easy path; if we fear, Thou heartenest; if we become diseased in soul or body, Thou dost heal; if we become foul in sin, Thou dost cleanse; if we lie, Thou correctest by Thy truth; if we sink into the lowest abyss, Thou

directest us heavenward; if we turn not of our own will, Thou turnest us; if we transgress, Thou mournest; if we are justified, Thou smilest; if we become alienated from Thee, Thou dost grieve; if we return, Thou dost rejoice; if we give, Thou dost accept; if we delay, Thou art patient; if we are ungrateful, Thou bestowest bountifully; if we are undone, Thou mournest; if we do valiantly, Thou gloriest." Was ever the blending of the divine sovereignty and human freedom more simply told?

God then is waiting to be gracious, and for man to be overly penitent, equally with persisting in sin, defeats the divine purpose of salvation. "Repentance to excess and sin to impenitence alike betray unto perdition. For while these twain are things different in character, alike but different, yet if we will but compare them carefully, we shall find that they both produce the same progeny of despair. For the first is unbelief in the Hand of the Mighty One as though it were weakened, while the second, insensate like unto four-footed beasts, breaks off the halter of hope."

Everything that the Christian has is mediated to him through Christ. "I have no King but Thee to rule over my spirit, O Christ, who causest me to bear unconstrained Thy sweet yoke, who removest the disease of sin by Thine all-powerful word, who didst purchase me with Thy blood, feed me with Thy flesh, establish for me a covenant of life immovable, who, sealing me by Thy Spirit as a co-partner with Thyself didst present me to Thy Father a joint-heir with Thyself, and embolden me to entreat my Benefactor by that Sacrifice offered in perpetual commemoration of Thy Passion, Thou Creator of All, and Life."

Christ is the sinner's only hope. "If I cry unto Abraham himself, he cannot, as is quite evident from that pitiful parable of Dives athirst in the flame, send to me, shut up as he is under the laws of common impossibility, even so much as a drop of water; and if I cry unto Moses, he, too, is touched with infirmity, for neither was he able to save that one man from death taken gathering on the Sabbath his supply of sticks; and if I cry unto Aaron, he was himself in need of an intercessor; or to David, he too, for all his abundant virtues, sinned; or to Noah, and Job, and Daniel, these, together with David, the prophet Ezekiel mentions by name when speaking in the name of God, saying, 'As I live, saith the Lord,

they shall not save their own sons and daughters from the wrath to come, but they themselves alone shall be saved'; or to Peter, the Rock of the Faith, he, too, O my soul, under the stress of such fears as thine, was caught like unto thee in sin."

If men cannot save, Christ must. "And because the saving power of men is thus in doubt, and they one and all have been shown to be but recipients of mercy from Thee the merciful, enabled by Thy might, called by Thy saving grace, cleansed by Thy power, favored by Thy salvation, healed by Thy health, saved by Thy holiness, and enlightened by Thy renewing, I also, knowing henceforth the measure of my earthborn nature, will but take them all as examples of comfort to those like them despairing of self-trust, and will resort to Thee alone, Thou Son of the living God, all-blessed Christ." Thus does Gregory delight to magnify Christ.

This Christ is the only proper object of faith, which is very simply conceived. "If thou believest in Him, thou also lovest, wherefore also thou hopest for his gifts as yet unseen." To Gregory's mind Christian salvation grows out of personal relationships of sinner to Savior. Wherefore he says: "I long not for the gifts, but rather for the Giver; not the glory would I seek, but the Glorified One embrace; not for life, but at thought of the Life-Giver Himself, do I with yearning pine; not with a craving for enjoyments do I mourn, but with a longing for Him who hath prepared them for me do I cry in the inward parts; I entreat not for the rest reserved, but do beseech to behold the face of Him who bestows that rest; not for the feast of the nuptial chamber do I hunger, but do hunger with longing for the Bridegroom Himself."

What place, then, if any, have the saints? In Gregory's scheme one humble enough. "For in this Book of Lamentations I would not depreciate the saved, without whom it were not meet to approach the Lord; but I fain would crown the Savior's Name, and tell abroad to the world His Grace." In one or two places in the book the intercession of saints is casually mentioned, if not inserted by a later hand. There is a prayer to the Virgin Mother, and another addressed to Guardian Angels. That is all. We

scarcely wonder that this man at one time actually fell under suspicions as a Paulician.

And what of the Church? Gregory's doctrine of the Church and the Holy Virgin is exceedingly like the Paulician. The Church is the true Virgin Mother. He would do no wrong who should "take the picture of the Mother of God as a representation of" the Church, "the great and beatific spotless Queen, archetype of all virgins, my glorious Mother ever to be praised!"

Not entirely devoid of ritualism, our writer is not a ritualist. The physical is necessary, but always in subordination to the spiritual. Baptism is required, and so is unction. "The font is not made perfect without the accessory of the chrism." There is a panegyric on the muron in which the physical and the spiritual anointing are not clearly differentiated. Yet the spiritual is stressed. The baptism of the Spirit is superior to ritual baptism. "More to be desired than water, He, too, baptizes, renewing and illuminating by his own sole sufficiency, and is ever efficient in that good work."

Nerses the Graceful

Nerses was Catholicos toward the end of the twelfth century (1166-73). He has a *prayer*, consisting of a petition for every hour of the day and night, which, since 1690, has been translated into thirty-five different foreign languages. He also has a devotional poem which he styles *A Lamentation in Romance*, but which is better known by its first line, "Jesus, the Father's Only Son." This is a summary in 4,000 lines of the history of redemption, and is said to be next to *Nareg* the Armenians' most popular devotional book. It consists of three parts, the first covering the period of the Old Testament, the second the Ministry of our Lord, and the third the Crucifixion to the Last Judgment, with a view of the later martyrs of the faith. Each incident described has a personal application for the reader. The poem was written in 1151. One passage may here be given to convey an idea of the whole:

From Salem, our Paradise,
With Adam the sinner,
Did I descend to the lower Jericho,

To fall into the hands of thieves,
Who both stripped me of the Light
And filled my soul with the wounds of sin,
And departed, leaving me not half
But quite dead from the encounter.
Whom the Levite Moses,
And Aaron, that priest of old,
The house also of the great Patriarch
And the prophets of the Old Law
Saw, with wounds of exceeding pain,
And gashes wide-gaping, and,
Passed by with medicines of mere words
Incompetent to heal.
Unto Thee, the Samaritan,
So called by the contemptuous Hebrews,
Would I display my griefs,
Yea, unto Thy divine seeing eyes.
Have thou pity on me as on Adam,
Put healing medicine in my spirit's deep wound,
Clothe me in my former garments
Of which thieves have stripped me naked,
Pour on oil and wine,
The medicine of life from the Spirit supernal
Bestowing once more the Spirit of anointing
And the Cup of the New Covenant.
Bear me away upon the Cross,
Bring me to the Inn, the Church,
Give me in charge of the Head Priest
Who offers Thee up as a fleshly Sacrifice,
And with the two pence grant
The Word also of the Old and the New Testament,
To care therewith for my soul
Even as the body is fed with bread.

The Keble of the Armenian Church, Nerses is best known by his hymns. These are numerous. The hymns of the *Hours-book* (Horologion) are all from his pen. The hymns of Nerses are marked by pregnancy of thought, beauty of diction, lucidity, pre-

cision and polish, marred only by a uniformity of rhyme, a frequent attention to form, and artificiality. Many of the hymns are acrostics, a device resorted to as a help to the memory in congregational singing. In the ensuing translations meter and sense are carefully preserved.

The best known of the hymns is the one to the *Trinity*, of which a few stanzas must here suffice:

Thou morn of my light, Sun of Righteousness,
shine into my soul;
Thou from God flowing, let flow from my soul
words to Thee pleasing.

Unity Triune, Keeper of All Things, have mercy on me;
Arise, Lord, and help; rouse me slumbering, with
angels to wake.

Thy name, Christ, is Love; make soft with Thy Love
this my heart of stone;
By Thine own pity, by Thine own mercy,
make me live again.

Savior Thou of all, hasten me to save
from the snares of sin;
Cleanser of sin's stain, cleanse me now who sing
yonder Thee to praise.

Well-known also among the hymns of Nerses is his *Easter Song*:

God the Word from naught created
In the beginning the heaven of heavens,
And heavenly hosts incorporeal
Of angelic beings rational;
The four elements also of sense,
Each the other repelling and attracting—
By which forever is glorified
The ineffable Holy Trinity.

Thrice holy, Thou, and sovereign Lord,
God in one nature eternal,
Light uncreated and creating,
By Thee did come created light,
Which shined that first day of the seven,
E'en the Lord's Day, upon the world—
 By which forever is glorified
 The ineffable Holy Trinity.

Explain we then the allegory,
Announce the hidden mystery:
The Light Unseen and Rational,
To pure souls only visible,
Shined forth on that first day of seven
The Resurrection's holy ray.
 Come with the angels, ye redeemed,
 Give blessing to the Risen One.

Thou Who art Love, in love didst bend
To take our flesh our souls to save;
In that same flesh wast crucified
And placed thus lifeless in the tomb;
This day divinely didst arise
And wast of angels bright proclaimed.
 Come with the angels, ye redeemed,
 Give blessing to the Risen One.

Thou to the women didst appear
And greet them joyously to life,
And on the Mount in Galilee
To Thine holy Apostles Eleven.
With them may all we worthy be
On that last Day Thee, Lord, to see.
 Come with the angels, ye redeemed,
 Give blessing to the Risen One.

Ye sons of Zion, haste and rise,
Tidings of light the Bride to bring,

Saying to her, thy Bridegroom risen
Hath conquered death with power divine,
And comes with glory thee to crown;
Meet thou Him in thine adornments.
Sing a new song to Him who rose,
First-fruits of life of them that sleep.

Surnamed in his youth, for his scholastic attainments, at the Conventual School of the Red Convent of Kesun, by way of an academic title, "the Graceful," Nerses came to be known by that title in the world at large for his Christian gifts and graces. He was a contemporary of Bernard of Clairvaux, and in a variety of ways a kindred spirit to the celebrated Frenchman. More than a hundred years after his death, subsequent to the fall of Romgla to the Sultan of Egypt (1292), his remains were reinterred in that fortress in a church built specially to receive them. Down to our own day his tomb was a place of pilgrimage for all races, it being said that even Moslems of those parts swore by the name of the Armenian saint.

CHAPTER XIV

GREGORY OF DATEV AND THE ARMENIAN SUMMA

THAT portion of Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae* relating to the Seven Sacraments was translated by Unitors into Armenian so early as 1321. Isidore of Seville's *Book of Vices and Virtues* also seems to have been rendered into Armenian under the supervision of Peter of Aragona, in 1339, and employed as a text-book for study. This Uitor propaganda, at its height in the late fourteenth century, called forth a vigorous reply from Gregory of Datev (died 1410), Armenian orthodoxy's great champion. Gregory was a man of extensive learning, and a prolific writer, having three books to his credit on Aristotle, one on Porphyry, several commentaries on the Bible, two volumes of sermons, and minor works, but is best known as the author of a *Book of Questions*, the Armenian Summa, finished in 1397, during the second Tatar invasions.

Gregory was born about 1346, in a district to the east of Tevin, in Siunik province. A pupil of John of Vorodn, he received his doctorate in 1387, and succeeded his distinguished teacher the year following in Abragounik Monastery. In 1390 we find him in the chair of theology in the Monastery of Datev, residence of the Bishop of Siunik who at the time was his own nephew. He was at Datev until 1408, when he fled to his paternal province of Vaspuragan, the depredations of the Tatars subsequent to Tamerlane's death rendering further residence at Datev unendurable, and entered with his pupils the Monastery of Medzob. In 1410, following an unsuccessful agitation on his part to transfer the Catholicate from Sis to Etchmiadzin, he returned to Datev, dying in the same year. There his tomb is still shown.

The printing of his *Book of Questions* was undertaken by a nuncio of the Catholicos of Etchmiadzin, Peter of Astarabad, at Constantinople in 1721, who however got no further with the enterprise than the production of a few "signatures" only. Other hands undertook the task *de novo* in 1729, concluding it in the year following. No reprint has since been made.

The book is an Outline of Theology, in style much like a collection of sermon outlines, bristling with "points," and appears intended as a handbook of outline studies for class discussion. In it the author shows broad erudition, being acquainted with Philo, the early Fathers, both Eastern and Western, including Augustine, and later writers such as Isidore of Seville, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas. He is particularly partial to the Pseudo-Dionysius, to whom he devotes his Third Book, and whom he cites full two dozen times elsewhere. The work consists of forty chapters divided into ten Books as follows: Bk i (chaps 1-3), Against non-Christian doctrines; Bk ii (chaps 4-7), Against heresies; Bk iii (chaps 8, 9), On the teaching of Dionysius on God, angels and demons; Bk iv (chaps 10-14), On the physical creation; Bk v (chaps 15-17), On the constitution of man; Bk vi (chaps 18-23), On the Mosaic Pentateuch; Bk vii (chaps 24-29), On Joshua, Judges and Kings; Bk viii (chap 30), On the Incarnation; Bk ix (chaps 31-35), On the Church, its sacraments and worship; Bk x (chaps 36-40), Eschatology. The author's expressed aim is to include "not all that is familiar to all, but much that is useful and sought by many."

How Critical is Gregory?

The method is hyper-analytical, the style usually dry, the content verges occasionally on the puerile. The science necessarily is mediaeval. Nor is it Gregory's fault that his book, written in a pre-Copernican age, was *printed* (1730) two hundred years after Copernicus had announced the heliocentric nature of the solar system (1530), and a hundred years after Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood (1628). Gregory still knows the elements as four, earth and water, air and fire. "For without earth there were no touch; nor without water apprehension or cohesion; nor without air motion, nor without fire sight." An apple "consists of the four elements, having its growth of the earth, whence first springs the underlying body; and then the taste, which is of water, and the fragrance which is of the air, and last of all the color which is of fire." Bk vi, on the Mosaic Pentateuch, is largely typological. Occasionally, too, like Mrs. Eddy, Gregory will let his exegesis turn on the phonetics of his own language. How-

ever, his usual good hard sense will not let him know too much beyond that which is revealed. In answer to the question, What was the forbidden fruit? he says: "How dare man discuss what the Holy Book has not revealed? Here surely lies the truth: The one tree was the Tree of Life, and the other that of Knowledge, and there was no other like either in paradise, let alone on the earth! We dare not therefore say it was either this or that." But here is a venture in explanation worthy of a Keim. To the question, Whence did the possessions of Job multiply? he answers: "All the friends that came together afterward and comforted him brought each a lamb and four pieces of unminted gold and presented them to him by way of an inspiriting help, and from these the Lord multiplied his effects and livestock, even as in the desert he increased the few loaves and fed the multitudes." And here is a promise made in the Preface that will command the approval of every biblical student: "Now the foundation of this work shall rest upon the immovable rock Christ. And the whole structure shall be fortified by four pillars, the first erected by the apostolical preaching, the second by the prophetical witness, the third by the truth as elucidated by commentators, and the fourth by my readers' truth-loving assent."

Foreordination

The First Book refutes the opinions of those affirming necessity and luck, and holding moral good and evil to be alike from God, together with the doctrines of Manichaeans and Jews. The divine foreknowledge does not mean fate. God indeed foreknows the evil or good men do, but by no means is responsible for it. "As man's cognizance is after the event, while God's is from eternity and before the event, and as man's cognizance varies according to the event, while God's remains invariable, so likewise is it with the divine foreordination and election; but he imposes no necessity upon anyone."

Anthropology

Psychology: Gregory is neither a strict traducianist, nor yet a strict creationist, but holds that man being one, both soul and body come together at birth into being by the eternal will and

providence of God whose image he is. In this view he follows Gregory of Nyssa. "The same rational spirit is neither a new creation nor an old. It is not an old, seeing that according to each body is the soul at the same time created; nor is it a new, for the self-same command given from the beginning by the Creator operates without weakening until the end; neither is a new command issued at each soul's creation. And that being so, as commanded of God it is not new, though in actual being it is new."

Sin: "Evil is not an entity but a deficiency." "The good is a natural property of us; for we have our being in the good; but the evil comes in afterward, and is the absence of the good." "Evil is not of God, and not of nature, and not in nature, and it is not nature." "The good is being. Hence it is evident that (good and evil) are contrary the one to the other, for all that is of the good is, and all that truly is is good, while evil is not-being. But now God is the cause of being, and not of not-being. Wherefore evil is not of God." Nevertheless the deficiency of the evil is one of the will. "The will of God is not impotent, for he does whatsoever he wills; but he willed and made us self-directing and masters of our own acts, be they evil or good." "Why," asks Gregory, "seeing that God foreknew, did he create those that should be such as they (*scil.*, the evil angels)?" His reply is: "For an ornamental effect to his works. Just as the painter puts the dark colors in the background in order to show up to better advantage the white and other fine effects, so likewise by the manifestation of the evil God intended the righteous to show up in brighter colors." These teachings on the origin of evil are older than the time of the Pseudo-Dionysius from whom Gregory directly borrows them.

Original Sin: "Now though the soul is not derived from the father as the body is, yet does original sin pass on from the soul of Adam to the souls of his descendants by reason of the body being generated in concupiscence." Augustinian teaching! "And if one ask, 'Why are we responsible for Adam's debt?' we reply: Sin is double, being of nature and of person, i.e., original and actual. Now our nature is corrupted by sin in Adam; wherefore even as he was punished, so likewise are we punished. However, the son does not personally pay for the father's personal sins, else

evil parents never could have good children." Original sin "is not remitted until one is baptized into the death of Christ."

Actual Sin and Confession: "Sin is a turning away from the constant good that is in God to the inconstant good of us creatures. Sin, again, is word, or deed, or desire contrary to the Law of God, for which man falls under the wrath of God." Repentance is essential to forgiveness, "and it is necessary that repentance should be at the feet of the priest." "The priest shall inquire (of the penitent) about everything necessary to get at the facts, yet so as in the inquiry not to teach the people further sin." "Then shall penance be imposed, of whatever sort called for, whether fasts, prayers, alms, mass, or whatever else be within his power (to impose), for it were necessary to heal like with like."

Faith and Salvation: "God justifies when the sinner fits himself for grace by doing that which is good." This is not to be understood as meaning that the sinner by his good works earns the divine grace, but rather that thereby he prepares himself for the reception of God's free grace: "For in order to his work of justice, God demands somewhat also on the part of man, demands, that is, what is due. But in doing his work of mercy, he demands nothing at all but what flows from his own will as revealed in the Incarnation of the Word of God through the Holy Virgin Mary." "Not by works, but by that faith that is in Christ, have we received back the original righteousness, the good works of the body and the holiness of the mind." For "when all law became of none effect, being impotent to save, then came and was revealed the Lawgiver Himself, who saved us, so that we should understand our righteousness and our salvation as coming, not from the Law, but by the Grace of Christ." "This thing called faith becomes great through hope, and is made perfect by love. Paul calls it a shield. For if thou art showered with troubles from the heights, thou shalt take thy stand beneath thy faith and live. And if from within the leaven of corruption threaten, thou shalt lean upon thy faith and shalt not succumb. And if sense shall press thee from above, thou shalt oppose to it thy faith and shalt not stumble. And if from the rear the fiery darts of Satan assail, thou shalt therewith defend thyself and abide in safety. And if from the right flabby success soften, believe thou in the joys that are above, and

thou shalt not be deceived. And if from the left failures overwhelm thee with sadness, thou shalt find solace in faith and shalt not sink in despair." Truly the Protestant Reformation was not so much a new discovery of truth as a new emphasis only!

The Mediator

Christology: Modern biology will hardly sustain Gregory's doctrine of the Virgin Mother: "A woman that brings forth a child is called a mother of man, though the soul is not from the mother, but by virtue of the body thereto united she is called a mother of man. So is it with the Holy Virgin, Mother of God, by virtue of the body become divine." Nor will modern Theology approve his explanation of the sinlessness of Christ: "But our Savior Christ alone was free from original sin, the reason for this being that he assumed a body not from seed of man but from the pure blood of the Virgin."

Gregory is an uncompromising Monophysite. But we must understand what is meant by that name. The orthodoxy of that Theology in broad outline is thus expressed: "Arius would have made out the uncreated Word God a creature in need of the divine anointing, while Nestorius would have set His body off by itself and declared it mere man. All those who thus think and teach the Church of all true believers anathematizes. Amen." The Monophysite view is that the Incarnation was not a metamorphosis of Deity into humanity, nor yet of humanity into Deity, but was an act of the Deity assuming human flesh while continuing still in the state of Deity. "Some speak of Christ as being (severally) by nature and by grace a Son, as do the accursed Nestorians and the Chalcedonians, whence there needs must be two sons and two personalities. But we thus confess Christ: 'By nature Son of God, and the same by nature Son of Man.' For in his own nature he united with human flesh, and being in his own nature God, he became man, thus becoming God-in-the-flesh by nature, and not by transformation or by grace." Hence "Christ is not a mere man, neither is he solely God, but God become man."

This necessarily involves the unitary nature. The writer endorses the view of Gregory Nazianzen in holding that God be-

came man, and man God, two natures uniting thus in one person. "This union we confess one person, one individual, one character, and one nature, and one will, and one operation." "Why do not we say 'two natures' in Christ? In order that Christ may not be sundered into two several personalities; for if we distinguish 'two natures,' of necessity we must also distinguish two persons." Gregory will not say "one person and two natures," "for the reason that that which is united is not to be again divided, for to say or to understand two natures is a dividing and a sundering of Christ." "But we confess the Word God, not in part, but entirely, incarnated and become man, even as says Paul, 'In him dwells all the completeness of his Godhead bodily.' Not by mutation or confusion, but by an unconfused union, the Word becoming flesh and uniting our nature perfectly with his Deity, and appearing in the body in one visible nature and personality, one Lord, one Son, according to the Holy Fathers' true teaching. Whence also we confess our Lord Jesus Christ one, and his nature one, for 'one is the nature of the Word made flesh' (Cyril of Alexandria and Athanasius)."

The unitary nature or personality necessarily implies a unity of will and operation. "Just as in the union of spirit and body there proceeds, by one will, one energy of thought and action, so does there appear in all the earthly life of the Incarnate Word, operating through one energy and power, a united will and a corresponding unity of action. Witness the scripture, 'Whatsoever the Father doeth, these same the Son also doeth.'" It follows that the Passion is the Passion of God. "All passions of the body are attributed to the man to whom the body belongs. As when the body of Peter is wounded or tortured, we say that Peter is wounded and Peter is tortured. After the same analogy the body of Christ is God, wherefore the Theologian (*scire*, Gregory Nazianzen) says, 'God was crucified, God suffered.'" Placed in that light, Theopaschitism does not seem so irrational as it has been represented.

Soteriology: Salvation begins and ends with Christ, our sole Savior. "He is the whole-burnt-offering, and the redemption, and the thankoffering for sins and trespasses, and the fulfilling of all offerings and the head thereof is he." He is the Divine Redeemer

Incarnate. "We confess the passion and the death of God become man, whereby we have been redeemed." "Even as the Serpent was lifted up upon the rod, so also was our Lord upon the Cross. And as he who looked upon the Serpent was healed, so also he who believes on the Crucified One is healed of the poison of the death-dealing Serpent."

In explaining the vicarious sacrifice, Gregory says that if Christ became sin for us, he did not thereby become sinful. "God the Father, seeing that his will was not done in us, sent according to the multitude of his mercies his Only Begotten Son to hang in our stead upon the wood, and deliver us from the curse of the Law, even as says the Apostle, 'He redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us, as it is written, Cursed is every one that remains hanging upon the wood.' This curse, however, did not affect him, and that for three reasons, viz.: (1) First, as he became sin to bear our sins, so he became a curse to bear our curse; (2) Secondly, he came under a curse for us, he himself being free from it, no innocent one being properly subject to a curse; (3) Thirdly, for that he himself was the blessing, the curse could not come near to him but to be changed thereby into a blessing, even as darkness is turned to light, and sin to holiness, and death to life, wherefore plainly he changed the wood of the curse and the grave itself into a very fountain of blessing to us. And others thus explain, that all that is cursed must remain hanging upon the wood, but not all hanging upon the wood is cursed; therefore, as the ram in the thicket is not accursed, and the brazen serpent is not accursed, so neither was our Lord accursed."

The voluntariness of Christ's sacrifice, and the federal headship, are stressed in the following language: "'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' But he was forsaken neither in himself, nor of the Father, dreading his own sufferings; for he came voluntarily, and not under constraint. Rather he represents in himself us who are forsaken and unregarded of God because of our own trespasses, he being of the same nature with ourselves, and the head of us his members." This voluntariness is climaxed and attested by his resurrection. "Our Lord said, 'I have power to lay down myself, and I have power to take it up again.' For though

the Jews crucified him, yet did he die by his own will. Which explains why he cried aloud in giving up the ghost; for the voices of men are faint in the hour of death. And though Joseph took him down from the cross, and Joseph and Nicodemus wrapped him in gravecloths, yet did he descend into Joseph's arms, and was anointed with myrrh, by his own will alone. In like manner also by his own will he rose again."

The Holy Spirit

The First Ecumenical Council, says Gregory, taught the procession from the Father, and the first three Ecumenical Councils placed under an anathema all those otherwise teaching. The Fourth Council, that of Chalcedon, confirms likewise the single procession. "And we in conformity to the holy orthodox doctrine therefore believe and confess God the Holy Spirit as proceeding from God the Father ('the Spirit that proceedeth from the Father'), and as 'taking' from God the Son ('He shall take of mine'). For proceeding is one thing, and taking is quite another." He gives to his doctrine a psychological explanation in the following terms: "The Holy Spirit is from the Father as the volition is from the mind, while the Son is as the cognition (of the same mind). Now the volition is not from the cognition, neither is the Spirit from the Son."

The Church

Papal Supremacy: Dionysius is cited as teaching in the sixth chapter of his *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* that Peter is the head of the Apostles. "Yes," replies Gregory, "but having read 'the head,' why overlook the words, 'of the same order'? For it says, 'Head, and of the same order with them.' " "Peter is head of the Apostles, not as is the Bishop of the priests, or the Catholicos of the Bishops, but only as one of co-ordinate priests is father to the rest." "But if one should say, It hence appears that it is not our duty to obey the Apostle Peter or his See, our reply is, You say a hard thing, for we do obey the Apostle Peter as we do Christ, and likewise Paul and all the Apostles, and their disciples, and their successors, and their sees. And we also obey the other four (*scire*, the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria and Constantinople), as coregnant with Christ."

The Sacraments

There are seven sacraments, viz.: Baptism, confirmation, communion, confession, extreme unction, ordination and matrimony.

Baptism: To the question, What is the punishment of an unbaptized child? Gregory answers: "Darkness only, both now and in the hereafter. For the torments of fire are the penalty of actual, not of original, sin." "It is legitimate to baptize children of infidels, that if they die they may be saved from original sin and the punishment of hell. But it were not legitimate to accept an infidel for God-father, for the reason that he has not the holy faith, neither has renounced Satan, wherefore also he is incompetent to speak for the child or act as its sponsor, one not having the faith being incompetent to mediate it to others." As to the thread of the *Narod*, used at baptisms, "spun in red and white, it signifies the blood and the water from Christ's side."

Communion: Referring to Exodus 24:6, 8 Gregory asks, "What means it that half of the blood of the sacrifice he mixed with water and sprinkled on the congregation, and half he poured around about the altar?" and answers: "It typifies the congregation cleansed by the font and united in the communion of the blood of Christ." In the Mosaic ritual he finds the justification for the unmixed chalice: "And should one say that it is necessary to mix water in the eucharistic wine even as Moses did, we reply, It is not necessary, (1) First, because Moses plainly poured one-half of the blood around the altar unmixed, which signified the mystery of the unmixed blood, and one-half he mixed in water as has been indicated, in token of baptism and communion combined; (2) Secondly, because the water was first in the basin, and he poured the blood into it, which is a type of baptism, whereas these men pour out first the blood, and afterward the water; (3) Thirdly, because he sprinkled first the water mixed with blood upon the congregation, which was an act of baptism, whereas these do taste the water with the blood! Plainly therefore their rite diverges from its type; and it is further evident from the foregoing that it behooves us to give the communion after baptism, and, as has been shown, neither do they do that." Why then do some mix water with the wine, and leaven with the sacra-

mental bread? "This is the true reason, that those holding the body of Christ corruptible are the ones that mix leaven and water, though they variously argue. But we the orders of true believers do confess the Virgin-born Body of Christ incorruptible, wherefore also we celebrate the mystery of his body and blood with unleavened bread and the unmixed cup."

Marriage and Divorce: "As to the exception, 'except the cause of adultery,' that means that for whatever cause, whether adultery or some other, they be separated, both being agreed to the separation, they must remain unmarried until they shall be reconciled to each other, and if only one, whether the man or the woman, be the cause thereof, that same one shall remain unmarried, while the other, being innocent, may remarry."

Eschatology

Future Punishment: Gregory believes in a physical hell fire for incorporeal spirits. There is only one hell, as there is only one heaven. "Middle hell, which is termed the prison of hell, is for middling sinners who have faith and no works, like bad believers, or have works and no faith, like those short in faith, or entirely destitute of it."

Purgatory: In this article of doctrine our writer finds "an analogy to Plato's (doctrine) on metempsychosis representing rational man as passing on to the sensuous state, thence to the vegetative, and from the last to heaven. So those holding this doctrine speak of men as entering fire, and being thence raised to heaven." In proof that there is no purgatory Gregory cites 2 Peter 2:9. The Armenian *Gayan* is a temporary "abode" for souls good and bad until the Judgment, by some called "limbo," and "paradise."

The Millennium: "The Thousand Years are a perfect number, embracing ten centuries. These thousand years are reckoned from the First Advent of Christ to the Second, and mean the many and more than the many. They are a symbol of the saints' perfect and more than perfect rest, now in hope, after death with Christ in the kingdom of the Spirit, and following the resurrection, both in spirit and in body, not for a thousand years, but in the life everlasting, even as says the Apostle, 'If we suffer, we shall also reign with him.'"

Gregory's Latinism

A word needs to be added to the foregoing review of Gregory's Theology. Anti-Latin in purpose and content, the book is not entirely untinged with Latinism. The cause and degree are thus explained by Ormanian: "The necessity for fighting the Latins of his time with their own weapons has compelled Datev, in his *Book of Questions*, to borrow and appropriate for the Armenians doctrines advanced by the Latins which, though not owned by the Armenian Church, yet are outside the matters in dispute. It would seem that Datev meant to show that the Armenian Church was nowhere short in its body of doctrines. Hence the Church's seven sacraments, and extreme unction, and the kinds and degrees of sins, and the explanation of the communion (*scil.*, transubstantiation), and the consanguineal degrees, and other matters of a similar order."²⁹

CHAPTER XV

THE CHURCH AND THE TIMES

ONE cannot hope to understand the Church without knowing how it reacted upon the times and how in turn it was affected by them. The story of Armenian Christianity parallels the story of the nation's decline. For in the Christian era Armenia no longer is that military power which under Tigranes the Great (89-36 B.C.) contested with Rome itself the empire of the East. Unable to prevent national decadence, Christianity, however, served through the centuries of political disintegration as the saving salt and redeeming power of a race, and has been accordingly valued. With that general remark made, we proceed to some details, bearing in mind that to review the interplay of Church and Times over a period of upward of a thousand years of shifting history is not a simple task and can be here attempted only in outline.

When Christianity came to them, the Armenians were by no means rude barbarians. Through a millennium imperialism and commerce had placed them in relations, friendly or hostile, with their neighbors and the world.⁸⁰ The proto-Armenians carried on a brisk trade with Tyre in "horses and war-horses and mules" (Ezek 27:14) so far back at least as the seventh century Before Christ. In the fifth century of our era Armenia's gold mines were a rich source of revenue to Berosus of Persia, and from the time of Justinian, in the sixth century, the country was an emporium of the silk-trade between China and the Roman Empire.

The ancient Armenians, therefore, were familiar with the luxuries of the toilet and the table, the adventures of the chase, and the rivalries of outdoor sports and battle. Their women knew the use of mirrors, combs, perfumes, soap-roots, ornaments of gold and precious stones, and fine linens inwrought with gold thread. Their tables were made attractive with wine of grapes and roasts of wild game. In the extensive forests of the land, now all but denuded of them, the men hunted the boar, the deer and the wild ass, and whiled away less exciting hours on polo grounds. Ever

eager, too, for the din of battle, they were, as Gibbon has testified, among "the most warlike subjects of Rome."⁸¹

The Early Church

In the fourth century of our era, when Christianity becomes the state religion of Armenia, we find the country under a quasi-feudal system, with a ruling dynasty of Persian origin never thoroughly established and constantly oscillating in its loyalties between Persia and Rome, and an aristocracy jealous of their own rights and prerogatives, never thoroughly loyal to the reigning family. Much of the history of the ensuing times is the resultant from the interaction of the four different political powers named, two domestic, two foreign, as constantly acted upon by a fifth force, namely, that of religion.

Zenobius, the Syrian, first Abbot of the Monastery of St John the Baptist, near Mush, a contemporary of Gregory the Illuminator, affords us the following rare glimpse of the physical and religious aspect of that part of Armenia in his day:

This is a goodly country, these parts especially being of pleasant climate and abundant waters, the ground level as a table, and on the mountains round about are numerous castles. The district is rich in vegetables and honey. It abounds in all kinds of good things and is prosperous, and the climate is salubrious. The nobles are friendly to monastics, free from disorderly conduct, and kind to the poor; they take good care of orphans, protect churches, and have an eye on everything.

Christianity found in the Armenians a people of high native ideals. Their legendary age abounded in moral giants, viz.: Haik, their eponymic ancestor, who migrated north for no other purpose than to escape the civil and religious oppressions of Bel; Ara the Beautiful, who lost his life resisting the advances of the whoring Semiramis, and Tigranes I, who with Cyrus subdued kingdoms because first he had conquered his own soul. The Armenian sense of moral decency was not to be lightly outraged. About 366 A.D. King Arsaces built on the south-west slopes of Masis (Mt Ararat), toward the modern Bayezid, a city which he named for himself, Arshagavan, proclaiming it a city of refuge for all

sorts of outlaws, paupers, debtors, embezzlers, thieves, wife-deserters and murderers. In vain did the Catholicos, Nerses the Great, and the nobles protest. The latter then put the city to the sword, between eighteen and twenty thousand households, it is said, perishing by massacre and ensuing plague. On the Church it devolved to bury the dead and care for the orphans.

That the Armenians, after the rest of the Empire had become effete, long continued the most warlike subjects of Rome, is in part explained by the attitude of the Church toward the military class. The canons of St Basil of Cesarea (330-79) excommunicated for a term of three years everyone engaging in the soldier's trade, so that when Nicephorus Phocas, in the tenth century, proposed to confer on all Christians slain in battle with the infidels the honors of martyrdom, the Greek Patriarch and his clergy demurred. No such prejudice against the military profession was fostered by the Armenian Church, the canons of St Isaac in the early fifth century (426) forming the solitary exception to the rule. Vartan and his men who fell in battle fighting the Persian persecutor (451), were canonized with the holy martyrs of the Church.

The canons of Isaac, to which reference has just been made, show the Church already grappling with problems. They provide that drunkards, brawlers, soldiers and the ignorant shall be excluded from the ordinances. Bastards likewise, and children of bigamous marriages to the third generation, are barred from holy orders and from the worship of God's house. Those in the ranks of the lower clergy who are faithful are to be promoted, but the careless and those who dislike study shall be deposed. On the chorepiscopus it devolves especially to maintain in uninterrupted operation all schools in convents and other convenient points to the end that there shall not lack men who will instruct the people in the divine commands. The chorepiscopus is warned in the discharge of his duties against avarice. Parish priests are forbidden to accept posts as tutors or otherwise in the homes of the nobility, on pain of dismissal. Priests and their wives shall not be buried in churches, but in public graveyards. The people are to be instructed to refrain from betrothing mere children, neither are adults to be espoused without having previously seen each

other and given their mutual consent. Priests are not to marry minors, nor even adults until they have assured themselves that no undue pressure has been brought to bear by the parents in inducing them to marry. Drinking during seasons of mourning is prohibited, and likewise wailing pagan-fashion over the dead.

By the middle of the century abuses of every sort were becoming so flagrant that the nobles advised a scale of fines. The Synod of Shahabivan (447) accordingly drew up such a scale, graduated to the standing of offenders. A bishop found in any serious scandal shall be divested of his ordination and fined 1200 drachmas. A priest found in like offence shall be fined 300 drachmas and dismissed. A man or woman found in adultery, if of the nobility, shall be fined 200 drachmas and do penance two years, and if a commoner, shall be chastised, fined 100 drachmas, and do a year's penance. Whosoever shall divorce his wife without cause of adultery and marry another, the same, if a nobleman, shall be fined 300 drachmas, and if a commoner, 100, in the latter instance the offender being in addition chastised, and in either case condemned to do seven years' penance. Whosoever shall divorce his wife for the sole cause of barrenness, if he be a noble shall give her 1200 drachmas in alimony, and if a commoner 200 drachmas. The woman shall have the right of dowry, and neither party shall be permitted to remarry during the other's lifetime. In a case of fornication, the parties shall be separated, and the man fined, if a noble 1200 drachmas, and if a commoner one-half of that amount. Any priest marrying a girl to a man without her parents' consent shall forfeit his orders and shall be fined 100 drachmas, and the marriage also shall be annulled. Anyone marrying a near relative shall be excommunicated, and upon repentance give half of his goods to the poor and do penance during the rest of his lifetime. The officiating priest in the case shall be relieved of his orders. A bishop or priest keeping a mistress shall be put out of the Church like any godless pagan. Such were some of the provisions by which the Church, on the eve of the Mazdaean persecution of the mid-fifth century, sought to safeguard Christian marriage and the Christian home.

And here are the provisions that have to do more directly with church discipline. Anyone desiring to follow an ascetic life must

live in a monastery under monastic rules. None shall be ordained a bishop without the Archbishop's (Catholicos') consent, and in the event of anyone securing ordination by bribery, both bribe-giver and bribe-taker shall alike be excommunicated. Neither shall anyone, being unworthy, be ordained because of high social rank, nor shall persons of low degree be excluded if they be worthy. A priest, deacon or monk, found in Messalianism shall be stripped of his orders and branded on the forehead with the fox-brand. Any priest who shall be discovered to have known any of his people to be addicted to Messalianism without denouncing them to his bishop shall be similarly punished, and likewise also any bishop who shall have been duly advised of the evil and winked thereat for gain. If the bishop himself be inclined to punish the heretics, and the prince of the province lay an impediment in the way of the law, the latter shall be placed under the ecclesiastical ban. Anyone bringing from abroad the relics of a martyr shall produce a written testimonial of their genuineness from the bishop of the place of origin. Such relics with the consent of the local bishop may then be deposited in the church and the anniversary festival of the martyr concerned duly thereafter celebrated.

There were other matters, too, of a different nature, demanding attention, namely, the superstitions of the people. These, if they had originated, did not terminate, in the imagination. When paganism was still abroad in the land, they were a real menace. The Synod provided that sorcerers and apostates, if they refused to return to the fold, must be stoned, and if they repent, must do penance twelve years. Any bishop resorting to a fortune-teller shall be deposed and fined 1000 drachmas, a priest 500 drachmas. A noble shall be fined for the same offence 200 drachmas, and a commoner 100 drachmas, supplemented by thirty stripes. Those using charms without practising witchcraft shall be committed to leper asylums to grind at the mill for two years, or pay a fine of 500 drachmas and do penance for two years. Those wailing heathen-fashion for the dead shall be excluded from the church for a year, in addition a nobleman paying a fine of 100 drachmas, and a commoner of fifty. Should the deceased in the case have charged lamentations to be held over his own body, mass shall not be read for the repose of his soul.

It is only fair here to add that the scale of fines did not long remain in force. The idea met with better favor in the West, where, a century and a half later, Pope Gregory the Great (590-604) gave it his sanction. The nobles' idea of penalizing penitence was not found consistent with the spontaneousness of the Christian faith. Soon again the gifts of penitents were placed on a voluntary basis. Neither did the Armenian Church ever sell indulgences.

However, it is not in the nature of Synodal resolutions to remedy abuses outright. Moral conditions prevalent at the end of the fifth century, as we gather from the Discourses of the Catholicos, John Mandakuni, are still very much the same. These Discourses deal with the moral evils of that, shall we say of all, time, viz.: backbiting and grudge-bearing, thieving and usury, swearing, wine-bibbing and theatre-going, wife-desertion and unnatural vices, wailing at Christian funerals and the resort to sorcerers and fortune-tellers. Here we see priests serving at the altar while wearing amulets, Christians compromising their hope of immortality by the employment of professional wailing-women at their funerals, and the theatre exerting its debasing influence upon personal and domestic virtues. The theatre, whatever its origin later in the West, comes not in Armenia out of the Church, but fosters rather the worst manners surviving a dying paganism. Without compromise the Church of Armenia antagonized the Greek theatre. Alas that the old paganism received some concessions. If wailing was condemned, drinking at funerals sometimes was permitted, and if the Church denounced the old-time charm and amulet, it offered the people a substitute in the relics of saints, which, it was maintained, did not, like charms, exclude the exercise of the free rational will God expects from the faithful.

The Saracen Period

The Saracen period was a time that created its own peculiar problems. The Catholicos Nerses III (641-61), having buried the dead that after an Arab massacre strewed the streets of Tevin, turned his thoughts to measures aiming to remedy the moral and ecclesiastical abuses of his day. Some of the actions taken at a Synod of Tevin in 645 were the following: Every bishop shall

personally visit convents, schools and hospitals of his diocese, exacting nothing from them; a priest dying childless may leave to his blood kin personal effects only, all real estate, unless he have adopted a son to be priest after him, devolving to the Church; the clergy shall be immune from taxation, and if any Christian (as distinct from Moslem) prince shall exact from them tribute in kind or forced labor, he shall be refused the sacraments of the Church until he repent; princes shall not appoint or depose at their will abbots over monasteries, live with their families in monasteries, or even stop at them to eat and drink, nor shall they exact fees from patients in hospitals; all persons whose life partners have been carried off by the Moslems shall wait seven years for their return before remarrying, and in the event that they return after the expiration of that period the captives, having performed due penance, shall be taken back by their late partners.

Another Synod of Tevin (719), called by John of Otsun, ordains that any servant of the Church, be he bishop, priest or deacon, shall be barred by intoxication from the holy office, and do penance therefor by prayer and fasting, and should he persist in his wayward way, shall be deposed. A layman, being inebriated, shall not be admitted to the communion except after due penance, and, if he be a habitual drunkard, shall be excommunicated. The day immediately preceding a wedding shall be spent, not in drinking and carousing, but in devout prayer and supplication to God. To conserve proper modesty among the young people, the services of go-betweens are commended in lieu of courtship and personal choice. Sunday shall be observed, not until the noon-day meal, but until evening. All work and travel on that day are forbidden. Sunday evening prayers must be offered standing, that posture being deemed in keeping with the gladness of the day. As to heretics and schismatics, intercourse with them is to be scrupulously avoided both at temporal and at spiritual tables (at social meals and at mass), to the end that they may be sobered and reclaimed. The faithful are especially forbidden stopping at any place of the Paulicians, or even going near them to exchange visits or hold conversation. They must "keep away from them altogether, yea, avoid and hate them as the Devil's own children and as kindlers of the eternal fire, alienated from the love of the

Creator." Those known to be holding converse with Paulicians are to be admonished and penalized, and, if they persist in their way, to be cast out of the Church as a veritable plague. Respect for Moslem prejudices is plainly in one way or another behind each and all of these enactments. The antagonism in particular to the Paulicians has such a background, given as they were to making common cause with the Saracen, and often, when far enough pressed, even adopting his religion. In the Balkans whole communities are said to have turned from Paulicianism to Islam.⁸² One hardly knows which to condemn the more, the disloyalty that could deny the very name of Christ rather than give assent to a supposably wrong conception of his person, or the blind zeal that could drive the dissenter to denial.

To the same period belong the acts of the Synod of Barda (768). We have seen that this Synod fixed the Old Testament canon. Here we review some of its disciplinary acts. No fines are to be imposed on penitents, but penitents may make freewill offerings for the poor. No man married a second time may serve as a priest. Convents, hostelrys and poor-houses shall be erected at villages, by which also they are to be maintained; hospitals for those suffering from offensive diseases and forbidden to be at large in the cities are to be erected in the open country. Bishops shall appoint in every church doctors to preach and instruct the people (this is aimed against Saracen attempts to suppress Christian preaching). Priests are forbidden to unite Christians and Moslems in marriage. Persons carried off by the Moslems into captivity who have conformed to their ways without, however, apostatizing, shall, upon their return, do penance for a year, during which period they shall fast on Wednesdays and Fridays. No church furniture or plate shall be sold; any headman of a village closing up a church for the purpose of forcing payment of imposts lies under a curse.

It was a perennial task of the period of the Moslem domination for the more fortunate Christians to buy off, feed, clothe, and sometimes bury others of their faith captured in war, and, perhaps, passed ere their redemption from hand to hand in what was a highly lucrative trade. The Doctor John, known as Vanagan (Monastic), captured by the Tatars in 1236, was redeemed by

public subscription for eighty dinars. Higher ecclesiastics had a higher price put upon them.

Occasionally someone attempted a more systematic method of relieving human distress. In that age when the very springs of human kindness seemed dried up, the act of one rich man of Persia, possibly a Moslem, witnesses to the power of religion, if but given a chance, to do its benign work. He is said to have brought from his own country, in 1092, during a famine at Ani, a camel's caravan load of wheat for that city's children, whom temporarily he took from their parents and fed at a place of concentration. We are not told how many of the parents survived to claim their children afterward and "thank God" as he bade them do, but many must have perished, when one citizen alone, at his own expense, buried not fewer than 6,000 corpses. Later, in 1140, or thereabout, when Shah Armen, a Moslem Armenian, ruled at Manazkert, it was an Armenian priest by the name of Avedis who engaged in famine relief on a large scale. Having distributed to the needy his own supply of flour, together with the sale price of the asses carrying it, he proceeded to enlist others in the work, travelling about, "Christlike," as says the chronicler, among towns and villages, preaching righteousness, appealing for aid, and feeding the widows and orphans. Unfortunately a corrupt clergy, angered by his denunciations, soon cut short his career, by prevailing on the Shah to order him stoned to death for a Seljuk spy.

The physical devastation incident to the Moslem invasions brought in its train gross spiritual destitution. The scattering of the Armenian people by the Turanian invaders was accompanied by the destruction of monasteries and their libraries, laying the Church under the necessity of shepherding a harassed people by the hand of an ignorant clergy, and without books or Bibles. Every Turkish or Tatar invasion meant the destruction of priceless literary treasures. The Moslems in 1144 destroyed the great Library of Edessa, and in 1170 captured the fortress of Bagabert, and destroyed at Datev, near by, the conventual library of 10,000 volumes. To realize the literary wealth that was annihilated one needs only recall that the modern Library of Etchmiadzin has had a manuscript collection of but 4,000 volumes, and that of Jerusalem of 2,700. Thus just as northern Europe was beginning

to discover its Bible, Armenia was made conscious of the loss of her own. In a letter of 1585 accompanying a manuscript copy of the Armenian Bible from which Pope Gregory XIII was entreated (in vain) to have a printed edition produced, some Romanized prelates of the region of Syria and Cilicia stated that "in the whole Armenian nation" then there were not twenty copies of the entire scriptures, and that a copy, ordinarily worth between 200 and 300 florins (\$800 to \$1200) was not procurable at any price.

An incident of the mid-thirteenth century will illustrate both the state of popular religion of that time and the difficulties under which the Church labored. There appeared about 1250 to the eastward of Lake Sevan a village miller by the name of David, who claimed that Christ had appeared to him in a vision and had commissioned him to perform cures and to convert the world, assuring him at the same time that the one of his two sons some day would sit on the throne of the Catholicos, and the other on the royal throne of Armenia, bringing deliverance to the East. In a very short time he gained a large following. He erected a wooden cross of huge proportions at the church door, and there slew animal offerings, distributing the flesh, together with shavings from the cross, and millet-seed that after the manner of the American "Pastor Russell" he had "blessed," to the crowds of pilgrims who resorted to him, plain folk of every type and condition, clerics and laity, male and female, old and young, the afflicted and the sick. Attending priests washed his feet, and with the water sprinkled themselves and the people, gathering contributions which were shared with the Moslem village headman.

The people were instructed to fast on Monday of each week and come to David who would pray for them that their sins might be forgiven even "to the seventh generation." The afflicted, David had his own peculiar ways of treating. Those possessed were administered a clubbing and told they were cured, with a warning to say to no one they were not. The lame and the withered were stretched out by the head and feet: if they expired under the treatment, their time was already fulfilled; if they survived uncured, it was because they had not sufficient faith. Of lepers he declared it was not the will of God that they should be healed, but that if the sufferer would come in faith, he could be forgiven

his sins. To the blind, David said discreetly, "Your time indeed is short for this life! Which would you rather have, the opening of your eyes, or the forgiveness of your sins?"—when invariably the afflicted chose the more enduring part.

The impostor was placed under the ban by the local Abbot, those consenting to forsake him being imposed heavy penance. But when the Bishop of Tadvan, Gregorius, with his clergy, repaired to the place to remove the spurious cross, he was mobbed, barely escaping with his life. Not until those participating in the mob were excommunicated was the situation gotten well in hand. David then was delivered up to the Church authorities who permitted him to retire to the village of Carni, of which he claimed to be a native, under a solemn promise never to practice his impostures again.

Cilician Times

The pastoral letter of Nerses the Graceful issued on the occasion of his accession (1166) is a good mirror of his time. In it he directs monks to stay in their monasteries and not to engage in secular pursuits, but to use their means for the relief of the poor and the captives. He instructs abbots of monasteries to cherish learning and virtue as they would their two eyes, and to be found faithful in the discharge of their administrative duties. He condemns those bishops who, having been deposed by ecclesiastical authority, reinstate themselves in their posts by bribing Moslem officials, and enjoins priests to perform the sacred rites not alone with the understanding but also with the proper decorum, avoiding going up to the altar in common clothes or soiled footwear. He warns them also against baptizing infants of Moslems, and charges them to maintain the solemnity of the marriage service, reaffirming the prohibition of marriages within the seven degrees of consanguinity, and setting down the minimum age of marriageability for boys at fifteen, and for girls at twelve years. To all of which he adds much common-sense advice for the laity, among other things instructing masters not to use men as they would dumb brutes, to exercise mercy, nor in pursuing the carnal to forget the spiritual, to avoid vulgar swearing, and to observe fidelity to an oath even with a Moslem.

The decisions of the unauthentic Synod of Sis, of the year 1243, devoid though they are of ecclesiastical authority, are yet a fair index of the nature and extent of the Latin influence. Simony is forbidden. To be worthy of their high office bishops must needs be learned men, consecrated by consent of their people, upon the latter's testimony to their fitness, only after proper examination, and not being in age under thirty years. The first concern of the bishop must be to appoint men of learning and void of offence as teachers of the Church's youth from whose ranks the clergy must be recruited, priests not being under twenty-five years of age, or deacons under twenty. Teachers shall be selected upon commendation of the people, and pupils upon testimony of persons of mature years. The bishop shall supervise the copying of Church books by master penmen, both learned and orthodox. Twice each year he shall make the rounds of his diocese. To execute the laws of the Church in the interim he shall appoint "holy and learned" chorepiscopoi, who shall discharge their duties in the fear of God and without avarice. The chorepiscopoi shall designate father-confessors, of mature years and learning, who shall shrive the people each Sunday, the priests administering the communion to the worthy. Both confession and communion shall be without charge. Priests shall perform marriages and baptisms, after due fasting, and at the churches. In the case that an infant is threatened with imminent death, a lay person may administer baptism, without pay. Proper decorum shall be observed at all baptisms, marriages and funerals. Marriages shall be consummated with a proper regard to the mutual compatibility of the contracting parties, who must be removed by seven degrees of consanguinity, the man to be not under fourteen, or the woman under twelve, years of age. Parish priests shall hold special convocations for confession, exhortation and counsel, once each year, severally for men, for women, for girls, and for boys. The people may not choose their own parish, but shall adhere where their bishop assigns them. For fornicators, heretics, sorcerers, penalties shall be provided, both temporal and spiritual, under civil and canon law. Monitors are to report on persons guilty of profanity, who, upon conviction, shall have their tongues slit for inserting a cord by which they may be led about for a day while being beaten with

a rod. Whatever fines are exacted for the offence shall be distributed among the poor. A priest found guilty of profanity shall receive double penalty, and shall be deposed. Of the same sort with the punishment provided for the profane is an ordeal by fire given in a manuscript *Mashtotz* (Ritual) dating apparently from those times and preserved in the Etchmiadzin Library, which the modern cataloguer says is not a rite accepted by the Holy Armenian Church, but a barbarous ceremony translated in ignorance from the Latin.⁸⁸ Barbarisms, however, are not the sole prerogative of barbarians, and the Armenians had their fox-brand.

The German, Burchard of Mt. Sion, writing about 1280, affords us an interesting glimpse into contemporary conditions, court, social, ecclesiastical and moral, in Cilician Armenia, in the following select sentences:

I lived for three weeks in the palace of the King of Armenia and Cilicia, and there were a few Tatars at his court; but all the rest of his household were Christians, to the number of about two hundred. I used to see them frequent the church, hear masses, kneel and pray devoutly. Moreover, whenever any of them met me and my companion, they did us great honor by taking off their hats and respectfully bowing to us, greeting us, and rising up at our approach.

The chief Prelate of the Armenians and Georgians is called the Catholicus. I stayed with him for fourteen days, and he had with him many Archbishops and Bishops, Abbots, and other Prelates. In his diet, his clothes, and his way of life, he was so exemplary, that I have never seen anyone, religious or secular, like him; and I declare of a truth that in my opinion all the clothes that he wore were not worth five shillings sterling, and yet he had exceeding strong castles and great revenues, and was rich beyond any man's counting. He and all his prelates used to fast all Lent on bread and water, and so did the King and all his nobles, save on the Feast of the Annunciation, when in my presence the Catholicus allowed himself to eat some fish and drink wine. On that day I heard a Mass in the presence of the same Catholicus, and of the King and Queen. Their ritual is an exceeding devout one:

their priests and Bishops are robed like ours. They mark all the canonical hours by beating a plank or other piece of wood, because they have no bells. All priests are married, and no one is suffered to conduct service unless he has a wife.

Thieves who are guilty of petty thefts, or other evil-doers who commit the lesser sorts of crime, are castrated, that they may not beget children to imitate their fathers' misdeeds. This seems to me to be one reason why there are so many courtesans there, for there are many eunuchs there, and all of them are in the service of noble ladies. I believe that the Queen of Armenia had more than forty eunuchs when I was at her palace.

All the Kings, Princes, and nobles are most willing to hear the Word of God; wherefore every day at the hour of tierce (about 3 a.m.) some doctors or monks go to the Court of every King or Prince. The Princes or Lords straightway come themselves together with their children and their great men. Some book of Scripture is brought, and is read in their presence in the vulgar tongue, for they know no other. The monk expounds the text to them, and whenever the laymen feel doubts and raise questions, the monks instruct them according to the words of the saints.

Both clergy and laity are very devout in church, and never do anything there but pray or sing or do whatever else ought to be done there. I never saw anyone laugh or behave himself unseemly in church. I have seen many other very commendable practices in that land, both among laymen, clerks, and monks, which in our land would scarce be believed to be done.³⁴

The Catholicate

Throughout the centuries, the Catholicate remained the one constant national institution. It survived dynasties, and national and local governments, and assumed with the passing of rulers the sole responsibility for the shepherding of a scattered people. As a rule the Catholici were superior men. Not often, if but lawfully elected, were they corrupt, and very rarely were they ignorant. To their spiritual dignity they joined a political prestige

that alike in times of peace and in times of war was not negligible. Often their one word was sufficient to remove an oppressive governor. Rulers both Moslem and Christian for political reasons coveted their residence in their own domains. As great powers in later centuries vied with each other in seizing the territory around about Etchmiadzin, so petty lords of the Middle Ages constantly made a bid for the supreme Head of the Armenian Church. Philaretus, a general of the Emperor Romanus Diogenes, who following the battle of Manazkert set up a principedom at Marash, a reprobate who did not hesitate to make of the crown of the skull of a fallen rival into a drinking bowl and send the remainder of the gruesome trophy derisively to the Governor of Martyropolis (Mufarkin), urgently invited the Catholicos of the time to take up his residence in his own lands, and upon the latter's refusal, secured the election and installation of a rival Catholicos at Honi (1085).

Often it devolved upon the Catholicos to go on errands of peace between warring princes. Frequently his missions were successful, especially as between Armenians, and between Latins and Armenians. Things were somewhat different as between Greeks and Armenians. Between these two races the long-drawn-out doctrinal disputes, which were not after all entirely doctrinal either, created a bitterness of feeling which all the wisdom and diplomacy of the best Catholici were inadequate to remove. The passions roused had their natural reaction upon the quality of Eastern Christianity, whether Greek or Armenian. Conformity, not sanctity, became the test of the true faith, and men did not stop at assassination if thereby they could conserve intact the rites and usages of their Church.

The Great Failure

Here a word of comment is in order on the failure of the Armenian, in common with the other Eastern Churches, to convert the oncoming hordes of Turanian barbarians and so far forth to safeguard the future interests of Christianity in hither Asia. It has been the wont to lay the blame for that failure entirely upon the corrupt character of those churches, and the criticism is urged in spite of the fact that a superior Protestantism must

needs confess after a hundred years of effort the same failure in many parts of the world. That those churches were corrupt, that they were formalistic, priest-ridden and superstitious, need not here be denied; so were the contemporary Churches of the West. That they had a physical philosophy underlying their dogmatics, might even have been a circumstance in their favor; Islam had just such a philosophy.⁸⁵ That the Eastern Churches were lacking in the saving salt of common Christian morality is grossly to misrepresent them. That they were destitute of missionary fervor is plainly contradicted by the facts, as witness the conversion of Russia by the Greek Church, and the Nestorian Missions in China. If the Armenians have less to show for their missionary zeal, they certainly manifested no lack of Christian interest in their neighbors, the Iberians (Georgians) and the Albanians, who owe to them their conversion in the fourth century.

Soon, however, conditions changed. The Armenian Church from the beginning, in fact, was placed in a position strictly on the defensive, fighting for its very life. That was in Mazdaean times. The Moslem power which followed in the seventh century promptly fell heir to the spirit of Parseeism. It was made a capital offence for Moslems to embrace Christianity. We have seen how even kindness to Moslems could jeopardize a Christian's life.⁸⁶ Could a surer way have been devised of slamming the door in the face of all Christian propaganda? The heretical Paulicians alone found a field for missionary activity, and that in Christian Europe.

The coming of the Turkish and Tatar races would have seemed for a while to afford the Church of Armenia her opportunity, but not even the Tatars, the friendlier of the two kindred races, ever seriously contemplated Christianity as a possible faith for themselves. Armenians, Latins and Nestorians preached in Tatar camp and court with but little permanent result.

A casual comparison between the Tatars and the earlier Western barbarians will show up the disadvantage under which the Eastern Churches labored in seeking to convert the oncoming hordes. The Western barbarians were more or less kin in race and culture to those whom they conquered and to whom they conformed. Neither had they any such fatal alternative proposed to them as "Christianity or Islam," one it is not at all certain they would

have resolved in favor of Christianity. To understand why at first sight Islam should appear to backward races the more logical faith, one has only to consider its progress in our own day among African savages in the very teeth of Christian missions. But the Tatars, like the African negroes, were alien in every conceivable respect to those who fain would have brought them under the gospel. Not only were they different in race, but they were also at that stage of racial development that made Islam by far the more alluring faith. They practised and cherished about everything that Christianity condemned. They were confirmed polygamists and entertained a low regard for women; they took a fiendish delight in killing for its own sake, and they waged war for spoils. Islam suited them well. It, too, held woman down, permitted polygamy, proclaimed a gospel of hate and the sword, and held out every satisfaction to the savage instinct for plunder.⁸⁷ When the Turanian hordes therefore broke through Persia, already Moslem, and pushing its eternal war with the West now under the banner of Islam, what could have been more natural than that they should make common cause with the Persian? It was on this situation that Western, as well as Eastern, Christianity broke in helpless despair.

CHAPTER XVI

RAVAGED ARMENIA

THE sun that rose in the West declined first in the East. Just when Europe was beginning to rejoice in the prospect of a new age, the darkest days of Armenia were upon her. In the history of the reawakening of Europe several dates stand out, e.g., the invention of the art of printing, 1438; the discovery of America, 1492, and the beginning of the Protestant Reformation, 1517. Over against these are to be set the fall of the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia, 1375; the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, 1453, and the passing of the Caliphate to the Ottomans, 1517, with the settling of Islam like an incubus over the East.

The Tatar Scourge

First among the causes of Armenia's final devastation were the Tatar inroads, which at the risk of some repetition we must here briefly review. In the year 1220 a detachment of Tatars, 20,000 strong, under Sabutai Bahadur, broke through the pass of Derbent, and overran Albania and Georgia. They wantonly slew every living thing that crossed their path, with the exception of the horse, which they captured for food. It was first rumored that the invaders were Christians, coming to deliver the Holy Places, and an Armenian priest with his village parishioners went forth to extend to them a friendly welcome. The hapless people were put to the sword. In 1236 the Tatars overran northern Armenia, capturing Ani and Kars and killing all men not of the artisan class, plundering houses, churches and shops. In 1242-43 they took from the Seljuk Sultan of Iconium Erzurum, Cesarea, Sivas, Erznga and Divrik. During those years Armenians in great numbers fled to Cilicia.

Happily about this time a Nestorian priest by the name of Simeon, living at the court of the Great Khan and there held in high esteem, was able to effect a reversal of policies (1241). Simeon being commissioned to inaugurate under his own personal supervision a mitigation of the hard treatment of Christian non-combatants, thereafter only such Christians risked Tatar

barbarities as offered resistance, and the Christian religion whose open confession by Tatars had previously been prohibited to them came to enjoy a degree of freedom resulting in many of them being baptized.

In the year 1244, Hetum I, King of Cilicia (1226-70), signed with the Tatars a treaty of friendship. It was a timely precaution, for in the following year the Tatars took Akhlat, Diarbekir, Urfa and Nisibis, and were fast approaching the confines of Cilicia. Hetum in 1247 sent his brother, the Constable Smbat, on a mission to Samarkand. He returned in 1250. In 1254 Hetum himself set forth on his historic mission to the Court of the Great Khan at Karakorum, visiting first by way of Derbent, Patu Khan, of Kazan, on the Volga, and then after a four months' journey arriving at the capital of Mangu. The Great Khan kept him for fifty days, ordered the exemption of all Christian churches from taxation, with the lightening of imposts on Greater Armenia, renewed with him his former treaty of amity and alliance, and dismissed him and his retinue with honors. Very soon, too, Hetum had occasion to show his fidelity to his contract. Returning home in 1256, he helped with men and stores the Tatar general Baiju (Bachu) in operations against the Sultan of Iconium. In this way, while Christians of other regions lived under the terror of the Tatar menace, the people of Armenia, more particularly of Cilicia, for a century longer dwelt in comparative security from that quarter. When Hulagu Khan in 1258 took Bagdad from the Caliph Mostasim slaughtering its inhabitants, he spared the Christians through the kindly offices of his Queen, who was a believer.

From now on Cilicia's great danger was to be from the quarter of Egypt, where the Mameluke power was already rising. For no sooner had Hulagu, having reduced Merdin, Harran, Aleppo and Damascus, withdrawn from Mesopotamia and Syria, than the Sultan of Egypt, Bibars (Fundukdar), invaded Palestine and Syria, capturing Jerusalem and Aleppo, and massacring their Christian inhabitants (1260), and penetrated Cilicia, and burned its capital, Sis (1266). It was on the edge of such a political whirlpool that the Kingdom of Cilicia maintained its hazardous existence until 1375, and Leo III (1270-89) developed his Christian

foundations, monasteries, hostelryes, hospitals and poor-houses, and patronized schools and letters.

With their adoption of Islam, however, the attitude of the Tatars themselves turned decidedly hostile. Toward the end of the fourteenth century the Moslem Tatar Timur commenced his depredations in Armenia. No other country suffered like it from repeated inroads of Timur's men. The last King of Cilicia was still in captivity in Cairo when Timur burst into upper Armenia by way of Tabriz, devastating twelve cantons, beginning at Nakhichevan (1381). He raided the country again in 1387, ravaging it for three months together, thereafter his depredations becoming almost annual. The raid of 1387 is thus vividly described by Gregory of Datev in a Memorandum attached to his *Little Book of Questions* (written 1389):

We were besieged by the Tatar spoilers of the nations, known as Khwarizmians, who now rose up against us for the second time, and in countless hordes have overrun and laid waste the lands of Armenia, Persia, Georgia and the whole East. Some, both men and women, they led away into captivity, and some they laid low with the slaying sword, their bodies trampled under foot, priests and laymen alike falling dead and remaining unburied, whilst still others wore out their lives in divers places of torment. Some were scorched with fire, and others through famine were exposed to the visitations of wild beasts, some tortured with cruel tortures, and others subjected to the distresses of terror. Meantime we stayed in the Fortress of Shahabon, in a smeltery of voluntary imprisonment, bearing in ourselves an aspect nothing short of the awful Day of Judgment. As then men, while enjoying peace and prosperity, in an unexpected hour will be overtaken by wrath, so now, on New Sunday, called Double Easter, the torrents of destruction were let loose upon us, when with loud yells Tatars of fearsome mien and burly, besieged us with drawn swords. And what things transpired here, affecting, not men with the herds far away or grinding at the mill, but men right here, at the very gate of this fortress! While one was saved, another, lagging just a little behind, was carried

away captive. And there was there to behold a heart-rending scene, kindred and loved ones, parents and brothers, whom we could nothing help, led off with tearful faces and stammering cries into captivity, or given over then and there to death. As then (at the Judgment) it will be of no avail for those hearing the cry for help to speak words of pity, so now with us it availed nothing at all to pity. For there was no turning back, and no helping, though we had been ever so willing, nor was there for the distressed any finding of help or pity, as though they had been the Foolish Virgins themselves. Those who had lived well, and those who had not, alike starved to death. Love perished and hope was cut off, while wickedness increased, and impenitence, that very worm of conscience to restless minds, prevailed. Beset by hairless monsters at the gate, communities rich and poor equally were overwhelmed by a great famine; for to whom much had been given, of them the more had been exacted, and men once swollen with pride sank now in utter ruin. Instead of the sounds of feasts, one heard a cry for relief. On our part, lying in discomfort upon our beds, we wished each evening for the day, and when the day broke, longed for the day gone. And all this consumed, not days or weeks, but over three months together, with never a recompense of reward being meted out to the guilty.

Timur in 1392 captured Van, and in 1394 Diarbekir, carrying off captives the latter city's entire population. In rapid succession followed the capture of Merdin, of Erznga, and Kars, with the usual accompaniments of slaughter, overthrow of churches, and captivity. Having in 1395 attacked the Kipchaks on the Volga, and in 1398 invaded north India, Timur turned once more upon Syria and Asia Minor. Having captured Bagdad and Damascus, in 1401 he sacked Sis, capital of Cilician Armenia, and in the following year he took Sivas, then a city of 120,000, destroying its churches, and burying alive its 4,000 defenders. He then penetrated Ottoman territory, as far as Angora, seized the Sultan Bayezid in battle, and carried off into captivity over 60,000 families, many of them Armenian. "The martyrs," says the chronicle, "were so numerous, that He alone could know their number Who crowned them."

The Ottoman Turks

The receding tide of Tatar invasions left Armenia still in the grasp of Moslem powers. In the time of political chaos following them, Persians, White-Sheep Turcomans, Black-Sheep Turcomans, Egyptians, Caramanians and Ottomans vied each with the others in ravaging Armenia and Cilicia.

From 1422 to 1437 Greater Armenia was the battle-ground of Turcoman tribes, the Black-Sheep Turcomans of Van, and the White-Sheep Turcomans of Diarbekir. Many Armenians of the regions of Sasun, Bitlis and Mush, during this period embraced Islam and were merged with the Kurds. In 1437 the Black-Sheep Turcoman, Jahan Shah, succeeded his brother Iskender, at Tabriz. He ruled over the Atropatene (Azerbaijan), Persarmenia, Vaspuragan, Siunik, Albania, Ararat and Georgia, acquiring the last-named country in 1440. He installed his son, Hassan Ali, as Governor at Nakhichevan, with provincial Begs under him at Van, Erivan and Tiflis. Jahan Shah made himself feared by his enemies, and established peace and tranquillity in the land. Under his friendly rule it became, as we shall see, possible to transfer the Armenian Catholicate back again to Etchmiadzin. In 1460 Jahan Shah, after defeating Abu Said who in 1451 had succeeded Shah Ruh, extended his rule over the whole of Persia, compelling Jahangir, White-Sheep Turcoman Sultan of Diarbekir ruling over southern Armenia west of Lake Van, to pay him tribute. Under the sons of the two Turcoman chiefs, however, the fortunes were reversed. Hassan Ali, surnamed for his father, Jahan Shah, was killed in battle with the Turcomans of Uzun Hassan, son and successor of Jahangir, who became thus sole ruler over all the territory from Mesopotamia to Persia (1468). The rise of the Sufis, a native Persian dynasty, in 1502, put an end to the Turcoman supremacy.

In those times Sultan Murad II pushed the Ottoman conquests into Armenian territory (1436). Later Mehemmed II, having captured Constantinople (1453), proceeded to take the Armenian cities of Baiburt (Baberd), Erznga and Erzurum. Mehemmed, knowing full well that the Moslem element as a fighting caste could not long remain in power without a civilian population to

pay the taxes, encouraged the Armenians, along with other Christian races, to immigrate into his empire, conferring upon them as a community the same civil and religious privileges as were enjoyed by the Greeks. While holding his capital at Brusa, he had promised Joachim, Armenian Bishop of that city, that in the event he captured Constantinople, he would appoint him Patric (Patrician) of the Armenians throughout his empire. This promise in 1461 he fulfilled by bringing Joachim to his new capital, where Armenians had had a church edifice of their own since 1391, and where they now lived in "six congregations" or communities. Thus was inaugurated that influx of Armenians into the Turkish capital which gaining volume with time swelled the Armenian population of the city by the nineteenth century to an approximate 200,000.

It is to be understood that it was not in the power of a Moslem ruler to appoint a church dignitary, and the Armenian Patric, required though he was to be an ecclesiastic, and aspiring, after his Greek prototype, to ecclesiastical powers in conflict more or less with those of the Catholicos, nevertheless primarily was a civil functionary, not a Christian "Patriarch," though by an easy slip he came to be known as such. His functions, like the conditions which brought his office into being, were mixed religious and civil, quite necessarily under the exigencies of a Christian community living under a Moslem government. To the Patriarch of Constantinople were committed all matters relating to "religion, church, worship, clergy, education, learning, marriage, family, inheritances, benevolence, trusts, the census, and the like, everything in fact which among the Turkish or Moslem population fell under the jurisdiction of the Sheikh-ul-Islam."⁸⁸

A war between Selim I and Ismail Shah of Persia resulted in the provinces of Erzurum, Kemakh and Mush being annexed by Turkey, the Persians retaining Etchmiadzin. In the first year of this war Selim transplanted a colony of Persian Armenians from Tabriz and elsewhere to his capital (1514). As usual the Persians devastated the country to impede the progress of the enemy. Selim extended his conquests as far as Egypt, hanging Tumanbey, last of its Sultans, and assuming the Caliphate of Islam (1517). Thus just as the German Reformation was about to begin, bring-

ing a degree of religious freedom to half of Europe, the Sultans of Turkey took up the Sacred Standard of Mohammed, thus adding to their armory one more weapon of religious fanaticism, which bore always most heavily upon the Christian population at home.

In 1535 Suleiman the Magnificent instituted the Order of the Janissaries, maintained by the forcible gathering of Christian male children each year for training in arms and in the Moslem faith. The institution affected especially the Christian population of Asia Minor, and most of all the Armenian portion of it. It was not submitted to without resistance on the part of a disarmed minority, and was enforced by massacre and every other severity. In the city of Tocat alone, in 1543, in retaliation for insurrection, eight Armenian churches were burned to the ground in one day. Sometimes an appeal to the royal compassion accomplished better results, and in 1545 it was resorted to with the desired effect. The recruiting of the Janissaries, constant source of dismay and suffering to the Christians, continued down to the year 1676, when it was abolished.

From 1549 to 1552 the Turks of Suleiman, and the Persians of Tahmasp, by turns ravaged Armenia. This conflict was soon followed by a second, in 1554-55. Suleiman returned to Constantinople with another contingent of Armenian immigrants from Erivan and Nakhichevan, just in time for the dedication (1556) of the famous Mosque that bears his name, designed by the Armenian architect Sinan. The victories of Mustafa Pasha over the Persians in 1578 resulted in northern Armenia, including Erivan and Etchmiadzin, passing into the hands of the Turks. Mustafa's successor in the command of the Ottoman forces, Ferhad Pasha, built a fort at Erivan, and demolished a church to get the stones for it. There was fighting until 1590, when Shah Abbas already was on the throne of Persia, but the Caucasian provinces, including Etchmiadzin, remained in the hands of the Turks.

In 1604, however, Shah Abbas took Erivan and Kars. Hard pressed by the Turks under Sinan Pasha (not the architect), he abandoned temporarily his conquests, but renewed the war in the following year, and succeeded in wresting from the enemy all that territory, including Erivan and Etchmiadzin, that had fallen

to him by the Treaty of 1590. Murad IV in 1635 declared war against Persia, his armies capturing Erivan and Tabriz, only to surrender them again to the Persians in the following year. The peace of Diarbekir (1639) provided for a truce of thirty years, the Persians being left in possession of Erivan, and the Turks content with their recapture of Bagdad in the year preceding.

Turkish jealousy of rival powers in the seventeenth and later centuries frequently interrupted the normal relations of Turkish Armenians with their Catholicos at Etchmiadzin. In 1667, however, the Catholicos, Jacob of Julfa, succeeded in securing from the Sultan Mehemmed IV a royal Firman confirming him in his pontifical rights over Armenians of the Ottoman empire.

Shah Abbas, of Persia

The wars of Turks and Persians on Armenian soil were long and devastating. The native population were robbed, butchered or deported, according to the fortunes of war, now by one and again by the other of the contending Moslem powers. Always the Christian population suffered; always it was considered legitimate and profitable booty. Moslems, indeed, suffered in these wars, as well as Christians. But these latter's lot was always the more embittered by their being placed in the cross-fire of Islamic hatreds. The treatment meted out to the Armenians and their religious heads by Shah Abbas, of Persia, whom the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* pronounces "a kind and tolerant ruler" to his Christian subjects,³⁹ forms one of the darkest pages of Armenian history.

The Catholicate being in debt to Turkish lenders through borrowing of funds to pay off imposts of the Turkish invaders, Shah Abbas, when he had reconquered the country demanded payment to be made to himself instead of the proper creditors, and, the Coadjutor Catholicos, Serapion, daily by his orders, for many days together, was hung up by the feet and beaten with rods, until he borrowed again to pay the Persian exactor (1605). The prelate died in the following year at Diarbekir from the effects of his cruel treatment. The debts of the See of Etchmiadzin for current expenses and to meet the demands of foreign extortioners

aggregated at this time 50,000 piastres, equivalent approximately to as many dollars in modern American money.

The common people were just as brutally treated by the Persian invader. The inhabitants of Julfa on the Arax met Shah Abbas in procession, and in holiday attire, the priests in full vestments, chanting songs, and spreading rugs under the monarch's feet from the river to the door of the Mayor's House, where, upon his arrival, they presented him with a tray full of gold coin. But what had been meant as a welcome to a deliverer served only to arouse Abbas' avarice. Such a prosperous people he would carry off to Persia! It was in the fall of 1604. Abbas ordered a retreat before the advancing forces of Sinan Pasha. All dwellings, and stores of grain and fodder were to be destroyed, and the country made a barren waste. The people were to be gathered on the plain of Ararat, and driven like cattle before the Persians, themselves in turn hard pressed by the Turks. When the Persians arrived at Julfa, the Turks were close upon their heels at Nakhichevan.

The order of deportation involved the four provinces of Ararat, Erzurum, Bitlis and Van. The population of Julfa was ordered to prepare for mass deportation with the rest. The soldiery compelled the people to cross the Arax, at that point broad and swift, or perish in the attempt. Some remonstrating had their ears and noses cut off, or were beaten to death; two were beheaded for an example to the rest. Men, women and children then were driven into the stream, to get across on boards, or hanging onto the tails of pack animals. Soon lifeless forms of old and young of both sexes were seen floating down the river, and more are said to have perished in the flood than to have gained the opposite bank. Of the fairer women and children many meantime were abducted by the soldiery. The inhabitants of Julfa had been given three days to vacate, after which the soldiery had license to plunder. In order that the people might never hope again to return, Julfa by the Shah's special command was burned to the ground. Its people were settled in Tabriz and Kazvin, but mainly in the outskirts of Ispahan, where later (1659) they built the flourishing suburb of New Julfa, a town once boasting a population of 60,000. The number of Armenians reaching Persia was computed at 12,000

families. In 1618 Shah Abbas made another raid into Armenia, carrying off another 10,000 households.

The earlier depredations of the two were followed by a great famine overspreading the country (1607-08), starving people wandering from place to place in a vain quest for food, reduced to eating carrion, and sometimes to killing and eating their own kind, just such scenes as were made familiar to the reading public by the daily press in the years following the First World War. With this famine coincides the last of the six main periods of Armenian emigration. The first occurred after the destruction of Ani by the great earthquake of 1319, when some of the inhabitants of that city fled to Van, others to Persia, most to Astrakhan, within the Tatar empire, whence they moved on to the Crimea, to Poland, and to Wallachia (Focshani). The second period of emigration followed the earlier Tatar invasions, the third the fall of the Cilician Kingdom, and the fourth the invasions of Tamerlane. The fifth and sixth tides of emigration coincide respectively with the first invasion of Shah Abbas, and the great famine referred to following it. If the reader wonders how Armenia's native population could have survived these disastrous migrations, it may be stated that the love of the soil persisted still in the hearts of the people. Not all did migrate, but fell back upon their inaccessible mountain fastnesses there to preserve their national life, while others, persecuted or in want in one empire fled into the next only to return again afterward to their paternal homes.

As to Shah Abbas, he made a pretense of cherishing a great affection for his Christian subjects, visiting their magnates in their homes, eating pork and drinking wine, and even resorting to their churches to pray before their sacred pictures. Whenever Moslems complained of these alien Armenians, he was wont to silence them by saying, "Remember, they are not here for their own benefit, but for yours." Meanwhile he employed his leisure hours devising ways of tormenting his captives. Now he threatened to transplant the Cathedral of Etchmiadzin to Ispahan, now he attempted to convert the immigrants to Islam, and again meddled with the quarrels of rival claimants to the Catholicate, or robbed it by heavy imposts laid upon the corrupt Associate Catholicos, Melchizedek (1593-1624).

CHAPTER XVII

DUSK AND DAWN

DARK days were ahead for the Church after the fall of the Cilician Kingdom and the last Tatar invasions. But, whatever the condition of the organized Church, the spirit, be it stated, of the common people remained on the whole unbroken. Even in its darkest days Armenian Christianity did not fail to draw to its fold a few at least of other nations or lack martyrs. Among those martyrs was Vartan of Tadvan, who pleaded with the Moslem Governor of Bitlis, Shamseddin, for toleration, and clinched his argument by saying, "Sir, God tolerates all the seventy-two languages of the world, and who are you that you should try to reduce them all to one?" This was in 1421. In those days also, two nameless priests from far Abyssinia, having visited the Holy Places, came to Armenia, mother country of Monophysite Christianity, and at Khizan, in the foothills of the Sasun ranges, met their martyrdom with native Christians.

Etchmiadzin Restored

The See of Sis meanwhile continued the sport of the National and the Latinizing parties. The Catholicos Constantine VI came to the patriarchal throne in 1430 through a poisoning. When the Turcoman Jahan Shah therefore brought to the north a semblance of peace, eyes naturally turned again to Etchmiadzin. The transfer of the Catholicate thither was made in 1441, through the initiative of John of Erznga, a distinguished monk, successor to Gregory in the chair of Theology at Datev, and associate there of Thomas of Medzob, a native himself of Vaspuragan, who saw in the undertaking the consummation of the ill-starred effort of the late lamented Gregory.⁴⁰

Etchmiadzin in that year was in the jurisdiction of the Emir Yaghub Bey, of Erivan, whose previous permission was secured for the assembling there of the electoral Synod. Some three hundred delegates met at Valarshabad, the adjoining town, both clerical and lay, freemen, property-owners and office holders, for the ancient nobility now was a thing of the past. Capable and dis-

tinguished candidates were passed over in electing after the modern manner of politics a "dark horse," an obscure monk who thereby became the Catholicos Giragos (Kyriakos) I. All that Giragos seemingly had to commend him was that for many years he had been an inmate of a monastery, and latterly had lived a cenobite's life on the slopes of Mt. Masis (Ararat), since his initiation into priestly orders had eaten no animal food or drunk wine, and was of a gentle and humble spirit, without so much as an oath having ever escaped from his lips. This saintly Giragos in one day was ordained a Doctor and a Bishop, and consecrated Catholicos. He then proceeded to the blessing of the Holy Chrism, which it was understood was to be distributed throughout the dioceses without the money compensation the Catholici of Sis had been wont to exact. A ban on the Catholicos of Aghtamar in force since the days of Gregory III (1113-66) was lifted, likewise all anathemas that the See of Sis latterly had been scattering broadcast. With these initial steps Giragos entered upon his holy office. Alas that the first Catholicos of the restored Etchmiadzin did not prove himself a man of any force. During his short term of office (1441-43) he accomplished nothing constructive, nor did he succeed in controlling his corrupt monks who practiced simony to the utter scandalization of believers.

The years immediately following the return to Etchmiadzin are tragic in their barrenness, and marked only by such a decline as always has been inevitable under Moslem domination, by unseemly rivalries between Aghtamar and Etchmiadzin, between Etchmiadzin and Sis, and by the purloining of St. Gregory's Right Hand now by one and now by the other of the Catholici. In 1477 the return of Gregory's Right Hand from Aghtamar made Etchmiadzin's claim to priority secure. Carried off once more to Persia, it was returned, by royal edict of Shah Sufi, in the year 1638. Etchmiadzin has remained in undisputed possession since.

It is a propos in this connection to explain that there is more than one Right Hand of St. Gregory's in existence, one at Etchmiadzin, another at Sis (now at Antilyas, in the Lebanon). For the designation is idiomatic. It has been customary in the Church to fashion caskets of silver, for reliquaries of saints, in the shape of a right hand in the act of blessing. The reliquary would be called

the particular saint's Right Hand, though any of his bones whatever might be enclosed in it. The two Right Hands just mentioned never have been opened, and no one knows what is in them, except that it is some relic or other of St. Gregory. This explanation is needed to correct the impression prevailing in the West, fostered by critics and by travellers, that the Catholicos of Armenia, in episcopal ordinations and other rites of the Church actually employs the Illuminator's Dead Hand!⁴¹

During the Turco-Persian War of 1549-51 the Catholicos Stephen V was travelling in Europe, visiting Italy, Germany, Poland, Moldavia and the Crimea. One can only wonder whether in his travels he ever heard of a Protestant Reformation. Doubtless the Catholic Church saw to it at least that he heard no good of it. In 1557 the Catholicos of the Albanians aspired to join to his jurisdiction Nakhichevan and its contiguous territories, while the Catholicos of Aghtamar had his eye on Khoy, Salmas, Arjesh, Artemid, Akhlat, Mush and Bitlis. By edict of Shah Tahmasp the jurisdiction of the Catholicos of Etchmiadzin finally was confirmed over the whole region from Ganzaca (Elizavetpol) to Salmas, a Moslem ruler defining the rights of a Christian prelate!

It was in 1562, also during the incumbency of Stephen V (1545-67), that Michael of Sivas, Coadjutor Catholicos, called together at Sivas some notables within reach, both lay and clerical, and secured by resolution the commissioning of Abcar of Tocat, son of Amir Beg, to the Pope of Rome. A copy of the spurious *Compact* of Gregory and Pope Sylvester was given to Abcar, with instructions to seek to re-establish with the See of Rome the relations therein indicated. Michael in the following year writes the Pope inquiring about Abcar, and intimating that the latter carried with him certain documents in cipher by way of a precaution against interception by Moslems and unfriendly Christians. "It is by you," writes Michael, "that we shall be delivered from this captivity." It was not the only time that the Pope was thus flattered by prelates of the See of Etchmiadzin without proper authorization. So far as we know, the sole success achieved by Abcar was the printing of a Psalter, in 1566, at Venice.

In 1627, after the depredations of Shah Abbas, the Catholicate of Etchmiadzin lay in ruins. The Church Relics were pawned,

and the Church plate pawned or sold. Nor had the bones of the saints, martyred in the time of Gregory the Illuminator, been permitted to rest in peace. In 1611 two Latin monks clandestinely excavated under the Chapel of St. Ripsima (Euphrosyne), and pilfered the holy relics. These afterward are said to have been recovered and returned to Etchmiadzin, with the exception of a small piece given by Shah Abbas to the Latins, resting now in Goa, Portuguese India, and a second small portion presented by the Armenian Bishop of Smyrna in 1736 to the Pope.

The shrine of St. Ripsima was converted into a sheepfold, and that of St. Gaiana, roof fallen in, stood a sad symbol of the devastation that was abroad in the land. These mortuary chapels were rebuilt in 1651-53 almost from the foundations. The Catholicos himself lived in Erivan, while at the Convent of Etchmiadzin a few monks and bishops kept watch, and the Cathedral was in a tumble-down condition. "It was," writes the chronicler, "robbed completely of its furnishings and bared of its ornaments. No books were there, nor robes, nor mantles, and the spot itself where Christ descended, the Holy Altar, was destitute of both hangings and lamps. No lights burned there, but perpetual darkness prevailed, except for an oil lamp only occasionally lighted and placed on the bema by an alien (Moslem), for the benefit of transient travellers, from whom he expected bakshish. There was no burning of incense, for no censer was there, nor any incense. The paved floor of the sanctuary was torn up, and the great windows knocked out and robbed even of their lattice-work."

Moses of Datev, upon being appointed overseer of the patriarchal estates, reconditioned the premises, building quarters for monks and pilgrims and erecting storehouse, bakeshop and refectory, founded a conventual Seminary for the training of clergy, and redeemed the plate that had been sold or pawned (1627). In the following year, however, there was no Catholicos in residence, the proper Catholicos, a nonagenarian, being in captivity in Persia, while a titular co-catholicos had fled into Turkish territory (Van). This situation was cleared up early in 1628 by the death of Shah Abbas. A thousand tomans in gifts softened the hearts of Shah Sufi's officials to remit the annual tribute of 100 tomans, and confirm the people's choice of Moses

for Catholicos. Of this Moses, the outstanding man of his time, we will now speak further.

Moses of Datev

It was not as a root out of a dry ground that Moses of Datev made his appearance. In a Church so dominated by the Monastery as the Armenian has been, it was to be expected that any revival of religion also would come from that quarter, and Moses was a product of the Armenian Monastery at its best.

In the year 1609, when Shah Abbas' fear was abroad in the land, a hunter discovered in a hollow of the inaccessible mountain fastnesses of the province of Ararat a man in monk's garb upon his knees, dead. The hunter reported his find to the Bishop of the province, Sergius Baronder, who secured the body and gave it proper burial. The discovery fired the imagination of the Armenian people, much as the finding of Livingstone's body in the same attitude of prayer at a later date in dark Africa fired the imagination of the English-speaking world.

Sergius shortly afterward going on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, was there followed by a priest, Giragos of Trebizond, who having given a third of his goods to feed the poor, and another third to the church of his native place, had set forth with the remainder on this same pilgrimage. Two kindred spirits, these men decided between them on a plan of reform for the monastic orders of Armenia following models they had seen in the Holy City.

Here Moses comes into the picture. Ordained to the priesthood at fifteen years of age, Moses had received his early training under the Doctor, afterward Catholicos, Serapion. He also went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, passed thence to Egypt with the purpose of inspecting the monasteries of the Copts, and returned again to the Holy City, being there appointed Warden of the Church of the Resurrection, and incidentally learning the art of making white candles, which later was to get him into the good graces of Shah Abbas. There he met the priest Giragos, and promised him that if and when he and the Bishop Sergius founded, as they contemplated doing, a Monastery in the province of Siunik, he would join them, a resolve he carried out after a

journey as Legate of Jerusalem to Constantinople, where also he was consecrated a Doctor (1611).

Such were the antecedents of the founding of the Monastic Order of Siunik. Sergius and Giragos, returning to the homeland, fixed upon the old Monastery of Datev for their headquarters, repairing the buildings and reorganizing the Brotherhood, the retreat thereafter being known as the Great Monastery. The Order of Siunik was governed by seven rules, viz.: (1) Obedience to the Abbot; (2) confession of sins of thought and deed twice daily, morning and evening; (3) renunciation of all private property; (4) fasting throughout the year excepting Saturdays, Sundays and Dominical Holidays, with entire abstention from meat and wine; (5) the partaking of food but once daily, with listening to the reading of books at mealtime; (6) the passing of the night preceding every Saturday and Dominical Day in vigils, with the celebrating of mass in the morning, and, most important of all, (7) the keeping of the mind pure, the mortifying of the flesh, and the meditating upon divine things and good books. The monks appeared abroad in their monastic garb, never in plain clothes as latterly had been the vogue among the clergy. Over the hairshirt worn next to the skin, was the Persian tunic split at the bottom and held together by a leather girdle. The outer garment must be woolen, not cotton, which was considered a luxury. Sergius looked after the temporalities of the establishment, while Giragos, Moses and Paul (of whom presently), with others, did the teaching and the "circuit work."

The fame of the Great Monastery spread abroad in a short time, and many of the clergy, high and low, gravitated to it. Among these were especially distinguished the following: Thomas, Bishop of Datev, who, with the assistance of Giragos, founded a monastery to the eastward of the mother institution, where also Giragos died in 1621; Garabed, also of episcopal rank, who founded a monastery on the Island of Seven, in the Lake of the same name, and two Doctors, both of them natives of the province of Mog, in southern Armenia, namely, Nerses, who in 1622 repaired to Vaspuragan, and reopened a Monastery on Lim Island, in Lake Van, where he lectured on the humanities, in which subjects he had completed a course at Bitlis, in the Convent of John the

Baptist (Amrdol), and Paul, a travelling evangelist, who exhorted men everywhere he went to keep the commandments of God, and refused compensation, distributing what was given him to the poor. He was instrumental in improving morals and discouraging superstitious practices, and in building and repairing churches and founding schools for youths, a task in which he was worthily assisted by Moses, and dying at Datev in 1620, the year in which Sergius, the founder, also passed away.

Moses of Datev appears upon the scene as evangelist about 1618. He saw the people destroyed materially and morally, the clergy corrupt, religion at a low ebb. He went about among towns and villages stirring up the people to a renewed Christian life. In the more important centers he opened schools for youth, secured teachers and gathered pupils. He found an able helper in the aforementioned Paul, then of Varak Monastery, at Van, who also had been active in the building of churches in Tabriz, and had an experience in preaching. The evangelists were reported to Shah Abbas, who promptly ordered them arrested and brought before him. Brought they were, fastened together by a wooden yoke and iron anklets. Glad of every opportunity to raise funds, Shah Abbas fined them 500 tomans, which, perceiving the prisoners penniless, he by advice of his ministers graciously reduced to 300, with permission to go about among the people under police guard and collect the money by solicitation. The collection netted 700 tomans, sufficient to pay the fine and all expenses, and to redeem many prisoners besides! The monks returned home and went on preaching.

The people's preference was emphasized by their indifference by contrast to the lot of the Associate Catholicos Melchizedek, who found himself in a like predicament with the monks, but for whose release no contributions were forthcoming. Melchizedek saw in Paul a rival money-getter, whom, as he did not belong in the jurisdiction of Etchmiadzin, he pursued and ousted. He then tried the same tactics on Moses who, however, being of his jurisdiction, was not so readily eliminated. Moses sent to the co-Catholicos the insignia of his Doctor's office, his cope and pastoral staff, with the message, "We indeed will remain silent, but whatever sin there be in this, believe me, you shall answer for it before

God." Melchizedek found it politic to be impressed, and told Moses to go on preaching. That, however, by no means terminated the pursuit of Moses, who finally came to Erivan with the purpose of passing on into Turkish territory.

The Persian Governor of Erivan, however, to satisfy himself that the evangelists' work had no political significance, meantime summoned Moses for an interview. The Governor had married an Armenian woman, whose sister, estranged from her own husband, was reconciled to him at this juncture through Moses' preaching. The Moslem, who in vain had remonstrated with the woman previously, was now convinced of the wholesome moral character of Moses' work. The result was that Moses remained at Erivan until 1623, preaching there in the Church of St. Ananias to great throngs.

Melchizedek now changed his tactics, and with an eye to commercializing Moses' popularity ordained him a Bishop. When, however, he proposed to make Moses a coadjutor Catholicos, the latter declined. It was not long before Melchizedek was compelled to flee to Constantinople (1624). The character of his rule at Etchmiadzin is revealed in a letter of accusation addressed to him in 1615 by Gregory, Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople. The Patriarch accuses the co-Catholicos of : (1) Simony, ordaining sometimes more than one bishop over the same diocese for the sake of the fees; (2) selecting corrupt and unworthy men for his nuncios or legates; (3) suppressing and excommunicating men who dared raise their voices against his malpractices, and (4) selling the relics of St. Ripsima, conveying the Right Hand of St. Gregory to Persia, and himself in effect being a usurper. The letter closes by demanding that Melchizedek disown a certain communication Zecharias, his legate to the Pope, is reputed to have submitted in his name to the Roman Pontiff.

Moses of Datev was consecrated Catholicos as Moses III, in the beginning of 1629, when the previous incumbent, David IV, was still living, but in captivity at Ispahan. The repairs and improvements on the patriarchal estates which he had begun in 1627 as overseer seem to have continued throughout his catholicate. Moses also sought out old records and secured royal confirmation for Etchmiadzin's titles to its properties. To his Conventual School at

Etchmiadzin he brought another Melchizedek, him of Erivan, a pupil of Nerses of Mog, who lectured before an advanced class of thirty laymen and clerics on the works of David the Invincible, a fifth-century Armenian philosopher, viz.: his *Book of Definitions*, his *Introduction to Porphyry*, and his *Commentaries* on Aristotle's *Categories* and *Interpretation*. To Moses of Datev also belongs the credit of having brought to a termination the system of co-Catholici until then prevalent, under which, for a period of nearly two centuries, from 1441 to 1629, a Catholicos chose for himself an associate, or coadjutor, to share with him his responsibilities, and in the event of his disability or death, to step into the succession. The system insured an unbroken line of Catholici, but at the same time gave rise to all sorts of abuses. With Moses III this system came to an end. He died in 1632, when scarce fifty years of age, and was canonized by the Church. To this day his name is mentioned in the Liturgy, along with the names of other great worthies ancient and modern, including Gregory of Datev.

The Jerusalem Conference

In the mid-seventeenth century the spirit of reform was in the air. On his way to Constantinople to compose one of many quarrels over the patriarchal succession in that city, the Catholicos Philip I (1633-55), together with Nerses, the then Catholicos of Sis, called a Conference at Jerusalem, to adopt measures looking toward the remedying of the unseemly rivalries then prevalent between the two Sees, and of the common abuses of the clergy (1652).

Thirteen canons were adopted at this Conference, as follows: (1) The Catholicates of Etchmiadzin and Sis shall consecrate bishops each within its own territory; (2) a candidate for ordination shall apply to the Catholicos within whose jurisdiction he resides; (3) no one shall be ordained a bishop without the previous consent of the people; (4) no bishop shall forcibly take another's diocese; (5) no diocese shall have two bishops; (6) a bishop shall not ordain men to the priesthood who hail from another diocese; (7) no bishop shall take possession of a diocese with the aid of Moslems or in any other manner condemned by the Catholicos;

(8) no Doctor shall confer a doctorate upon any person of immature age or without a good reputation for learning or character; (9) each priest shall be ordained by his own bishop, with the consent of the people; (10) bishops and priests shall not rob each other of their just shares of the people's gifts; (11) priests shall not take parishes forcibly from each other; (12) priests shall announce all pending marriages in their several churches many days in advance, so that any impediments existing may be made known; (13) priests who are widowers, if they be advanced in years and without growing children, and if they have a reputation for modest behavior, may continue in parish service, but otherwise must retire to monasteries. At this conference Philip showed a truly wise and Christian spirit in refraining from dragging into the discussions any questions of priority as between the two Sees.

He then proceeded to Constantinople, talked and preached peace, and raised money to pay off a 40,000 piastre debt that had accumulated through his predecessors purchasing office on borrowed money. Incidentally he secured a temporary order from the Porte recognizing his supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Turkish Armenians (1652-53). He returned to Etchmiadzin to undertake the erection of a Campanile, no easy task then, as it had to be prosecuted against the strong opposition of a Moslem Governor. It was still building when he died, after a brief illness, having preached his last sermon from the text, "Thou canst no longer be steward." His successor, Jacob IV, did not secure the Governor's permission for finishing the structure until two years after Philip's death. It was dedicated in the year following (1658).

In his early years as Catholicos, Philip befriended Paul Piromalli, the Dominican priest whom Pope Urban VIII sent to Armenia in 1631. At first jailed by the Persian Governor of Nakhichevan, Piromalli in 1634, or two years afterward, came to Etchmiadzin, and as teacher of foreign languages and philosophy, gained the favor of the Catholicos. He also preached in Armenian in churches throughout Asia Minor, and in St. Gregory's of Galata, in Constantinople, a church frequently figuring in later Papal Armenian history.

CHAPTER XVIII

CONDITIONS ABROAD

ARMENIAN history after the loss of political self-determination becomes in a large measure the story of a Diaspora. The center of interest through some centuries shifts to the colonies, of which Lemberg, Constantinople and New Julfa shall claim here our special attention.

Lemberg

The Armenian colony of Poland dates from the fall of Ani to Alp Arslan (1065). The center of this colony was at Lwow (Lemberg). In this city the Armenians built first (1173) a small frame church, which in 1363 was replaced by a more pretentious stone structure. In 1467 one by the name of Hachadur was ordained by Aristaces II, Catholicos of the time, Bishop of Lemberg, under pledge to conform himself to that city's charter as a free city granted to it in 1356 by Casimir III. In 1610 Melchizedek, the corrupt co-Catholicos of Etchmiadzin, appointed Zecharias of Van, a man of kindred spirit with himself to the nunciature of the West (Poland and Italy).

Apparently he knew what he was about. For in 1625, following a popular uproar at Constantinople against him and his henchmen, he departed for Poland, arriving at Lemberg the following year. Meanwhile, in 1623, the episcopal chair of the latter city had become vacant. Duly bribed, therefore, and against the people's expressed wishes, he ordained to the place one Nicholas Torosowitz (Torosian), a twenty-two-year-old monk, son of a wealthy merchant of the colony. To make his position secure, Nicholas, who is said to have had the name of being "unworthy of the position and acceptable to no one," was provided by the reprobate prelate with a writ of excommunication against all and sundry who should dare to withstand his consecration, which on the ensuing Sunday he read to an astonished congregation. Before the year was out, Melchizedek himself died at Kamenitz.

Two years elapsed. It devolved on Moses of Datev, upon ascending the pontifical throne, to issue a bull of excommunication

against Nicholas (1629). The latter setting it at naught, Moses dispatched to Lemberg an envoy, none other than Hachadur of Cesarea, to depose him. The people and their city council were solidly with the Catholicos and against Nicholas. Sensing the situation the latter then repaired to the nearby Monastery of the Barefoot Carmelites and publicly received Catholicism for himself and his people! Thereupon the Papal Archbishop of Lemberg put the Armenian congregation under the ban. Meanwhile the city police broke open the church door that had been locked against Nicholas, and threatened with fines and imprisonment any and all doing contrary to police orders. The people resorting to non-co-operation, Nicholas then proceeded to seize all the churches and monasteries of his diocese, and to place the community under the ecclesiastical ban. Priests and outstanding citizens were jailed pending payment of three to four hundred groschen each in fines, large sums were demanded for burials while the dead, preserved in pitch, remained for days unburied, and baptisms, confirmations and marriages were prohibited, forcing the people to seek the sacraments clandestinely elsewhere. The community petitioned that at least one church might be surrendered to them for their use. "I," declared Nicholas, "am a Catholic Archbishop, and cannot give any church of mine into the hands of schismatics!" The people sent a priest and layman to Etchmiadzin to advise the Catholicos of their plight. Moses wrote thereupon to the Polish King, Sigismund III, to the Latin Archbishop of Lemberg, and finally to Pope Urban VIII himself. Nothing came of it. The following year Moses died.

The hard-pressed Armenians of Lemberg now went so far as to seek through the Catholicos Philip I the intercession of Shah Sufi of Persia with the King of Poland (1638). In a reply Philip addressed himself "to the Armenian colonies of Lemberg, Kamenitz, Jaslo, Zamosc and Lutsk." He had seen personally the Polish Ambassador to the Shah and had been by him reassured. The net result was that the Pope sent Paul Piromalli to Poland to attempt to make peace between Nicholas and his people. Both Piromalli and Nicholas now went to see the Pope. Nicholas had been leading a notoriously dissolute life. What chance did he have? But through the support of the Jesuits he won his fight.

The people, impotent to secure redress, then began to migrate to Moldavia and elsewhere, until of the original thousand Armenian families of Lemberg barely a hundred remained. His income dwindling, Nicholas resorted to the sale to Jewish brokers of the gold and silver plate of his churches, of relics of Armenian royalty, and of rare old manuscripts of which there were in the colonial archives over a thousand. This situation continued for over a decade, until Nicholas having fooled the Pope, proceeded to fool the Catholicos also. Philip in 1652 being at Constantinople, Nicholas came to see him. The two patched up their differences, Nicholas giving in his humble submission to the Catholicos and all his successors, while keeping in connection with Rome! Years went by, and in 1668 Nicholas was summoned to Rome. He arrived there with a retinue of twenty men, including two sons. Judging then the episcopal chair of Lemberg vacated, the Catholicos Jacob IV (1655-80) sent the Doctor Theodore Vartanowitz, a Polish Armenian trained at Etchmiadzin, to take charge. Vartanowitz, however, found himself in an impossible position, resigned his post, and returned to Aleppo. The Pope in 1674 returned Nicholas to his post at Lemberg. Nicholas died in office in 1681 at the good old age of seventy-seven years. Vartan Jonan, Nicholas' successor, in 1689 completed the process of Romanization at Lemberg, when in consequence the Armenians of Moldavia, Wallachia and Bucovina withdrew finally from the communion of its Bishop.

The Polish colony gave to the Church at least one scholar, Stephen of Lemberg, master of languages in the conventual school of Etchmiadzin 1640-80, and translator of several works from the Latin, viz.: *Josephus*, the *Pseudo-Dionysius*, a *Book of Causes*, *Parabolic Words*, the *Mirror of Conduct*, an *Anthology of Prayers*, an *Angelology*, and a *History of the Koran*.

Constantinople

The cupidity of Turkish officials, taking occasion from the rivalries of certain of the Armenian clergy, often in this period turned the Patriarchate of Constantinople into a plaything and a byword. In the seventeenth century the fortunes of the papal controversy, with the political intrigues that it invariably involved,

resulted in incumbents each more corrupt than his predecessor being appointed and ousted at short intervals. Whereas during the first hundred years of the Patriarchate but seven men in succession had occupied that office, in the course of the next 150 years, that is, from 1561 to 1715, the average term of office was but a little over two years, not fewer than sixty-nine patriarchs in that time following each other in rapid succession, forty-nine different men, of whom some lost their position and recovered it several times, according as each found a little more money with which to bribe Turkish officialdom. Noted among Latinophil patriarchs were John the Deaf, four times patriarch between 1600 and 1636, Zecharias of Van, twice between 1626 and 1639, and Thomas of Aleppo, twice between 1644 and 1658.

From 1641 to 1650 the Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople was once more the toy of the ecclesiastical factions. At four different times during that period the same man David ascended the patriarchal throne as the nationals gained the upper hand over the papists. Involved in the intrigues of the papal Armenians at this time was the Theatin monk, Clemens Galanus, professedly a teacher and practising physician. Originally sent out in 1636 by Pope Urban VIII to the Caucasus, this Italian in 1640 was instructed to proceed to Constantinople. In the following year, the Patriarchate of Constantinople again being the apple of discord between nationals and papists, a Romanist Armenian, Giragos of Erivan, was installed in the patriarchal throne. The French Ambassador, Jean de la Haye, rendered to Catholic intrigue every aid and assistance. Giragos, however, died of the bubonic plague in 1642. His successor, Hachadur of Sivas, afterward Catholicos of Sis, also was Roman-minded, but he had reigned only a few months when he was displaced by the nationalist David, once before Patriarch. The French and Venetian Ambassadors then deemed it wise to smuggle Galanus out of the country (1643). Galanus published at Rome in 1651 his three-volume work on *The Union of the Holy Armenian Church with the Great Holy Church of Rome*. He died at Lemberg in 1666. In those troubled times came the Catholicos Philip I to Constantinople to talk and preach peace (1652).

In those years, as in more recent massacres, it was a pastime

of the Turks to do Christians to death and cast their bodies into the sea. The pleasure derived seems to have been proportional to the number and to the rank of the victims. Cyril Lucar, Protestant-minded Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, was so treated in 1638. In 1657 some 4,000 Greeks were put to death on the charge of plotting against the Government, and their bodies cast into the sea. Their Patriarch, Parthenius III, was hanged in his official vestments, and his body likewise flung into the deep. It was now the Armenians' turn.

In the year last named the Porte was advised that laymen were running the Armenian Patriarchate. The fact was that controversy at times became so bitter that rather than risk the election of a Patriarch, lay vicars transacted the affairs of the office, through a term in the aggregate of over five years. The Porte called the laymen in question to task on the irregularity, and being unable to give satisfactory cause for it they were all thrust into jail. To "come out thence," it cost them 10,000 piastres. But as they offered by way of an annual tribute 40,000 akjés in excess of the 100,000 which the Patriarchs had been paying, in characteristic Turkish fashion they were permitted to retain their posts for a while longer.

Then Thomas Vartabed, of Aleppo, once before for a brief period Patriarch, and now again a candidate of the papal party, repaired to the Porte, and secured the consent of Turkish officialdom, in particular the Tefterdar or Recorder, to his candidacy for the patriarchship with ecumenical powers, similar to those of the Greek Patriarch, over all the Armenians of Turkey, including the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. He made a bid of 400,000 akjés for an annual community tribute as against the 140,000 promised by the lay vicars, and proceeding to Adrianople where the Grand Vizier, Mehemed Pasha Keuprulu, was engaged in directing preparations for the Austrian War, interviewed that dignitary, and secured in return for lavish gifts his promise of an appointment. Upon this the twenty-four lay vicars in power met together and elected eight of their own number to go to Adrianople to persuade the Vizier to rescind his order. They went, but were unsuccessful. The Grand Vizier drove the delegation away in disgrace, and sent Thomas, under escort of Sinan Pasha, Keuprulu's underling, to

Constantinople to assume office. The lay vicars now made an attempt to gain the ear of Sinan, which done they offered him a large sum of money if he but would write to his superior that Thomas was *persona non grata* with the Armenian community. In self-defense Thomas a second time repaired to Adrianople, had an audience of the Grand Vizier, and returning with an order to Sinan Pasha to give no heed to the vicars, took possession of the Patriarchate with a military guard.

Not to be thus tamely defeated the vicars then stirred up the populace against the Patriarch, on the plea that he had taken office irregularly and by force, had put the Patriarch of Jerusalem in the same class with other Bishops subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople, and had increased by several times the burden of the annual community tribute. A vast mob then hastened to the palace of Sinan Pasha in protest, declaring to him that Thomas was not even an Armenian, but a Frank, having travelled in Italy in the garb of the foreign clergy. Thomas thereupon by order of Sinan Pasha was unceremoniously cast into a dungeon. There administered poison he died, his body, with a mat spread over it, lying at the prison door for three days following, to be then flung by the Turks into the Golden Horn, in whose waters for days it was seen floating (1658).

To understand the further progress of events one will need to glance at some developments in the mother country. The Jesuits in 1683 extended their Ispahan Mission, begun in 1650, to Erivan, with the distinct object of converting the Catholicos. Five years later they founded a Mission for Turkish Armenia at Erzurum. This last Mission so far prospered that early in the eighteenth century it was divided into two branches, the one, named for St. Ignatius, extending over Akhaltzik, Ispir, Gumush Hané, Baiburt and Trebizond, with twenty-seven villages in one direction, the other bearing the name of St. Gregory the Illuminator, extending over Arabgir, Tortum, Hassan Kalé, Kars and Bayezid, with forty villages in the other.

So early as 1690 religious controversy in these regions assumed such proportions that the Catholicos Eliezer I himself was powerless to allay it. In the hope of curbing the activities of the Jesuits the Armenian Catholicos sometimes cultivated friendly relations

with the Popes. The Catholicos Nahabed I (1691-1705) in 1695 wrote a letter to the Supreme Pontiff, to which the Pope replied graciously, and sent Nahabed, it is said, as a token of his regard, a costly throne. This correspondence gave rise to the rumor that the Catholicos designed to Romanize his Church, in fear of which eventually the Persian government was prevailed upon with many presents to send Nahabed into a temporary exile.

But this was by no means the end of the trouble. It had its repercussions in the West. Nahabed's correspondence occasioned a lively controversy among the Armenian clergy of Adrianople destined soon to spread to the Turkish capital (1700). Three priests of the former city especially approved of Nahabed's action in cultivating the Pope's friendship, whilst others just as heartily disapproved. Ephraim, acting Bishop of Adrianople and late Patriarch of Constantinople, sent the aforementioned three priests in chains to the naval arsenal at the capital. With them went also in disgrace the reigning Patriarch Melchizedek, at that juncture at Adrianople on business, who on the ground that he had taken the priests' part was deposed from office by order of the Grand Vizier, Husein Keuprulu. Ephraim incidentally regained his throne.

From all directions priests now flocked to Constantinople, to defend the cause of Catholicism or that of Gregorianism, as the case might be. With the object of detecting all Catholics or Franks, the Patriarch now issued an order to all parish priests to put to everyone coming to the confessional the test question of "the one nature." Men of standing in the community meantime were called up one by one and pressed to give assent to the national orthodoxy. As might have been expected, these measures only defeated their object by emphasizing old lines of cleavage. More than ever from this time forward the papists absented themselves from the national churches.

Neither did Ephraim rest content with tame measures alone. He secured an imperial edict to place under arrest all Armenians throughout Turkey professing Greek or Latin doctrine. Under this order many were brought up before the Kaimakam or acting Vizier, bastinadoed and committed to the naval arsenal, many cast into prisons, tortured, or fined to impoverishment. Some suc-

ceeded in fleeing the city. In the provinces, the Chaldean or Syrian Catholic Catholicos Peter, in particular was arrested with three of his bishops, two priests and two laymen, and incarcerated in the fortress of Adana, where he and one of his bishops also died.

Avedick Vartabed, acting Bishop of Erznga, learning in 1701 of the commotions at the capital, hastened thither to take a hand. Through the influence of the Mufti, Feizullah, whom he had personally known at Erznga, Avedick received appointment as Vicar of the Patriarch Ephraim, whom also a month or so later he supplanted. By an irony of fate, the Patriarch who had started the persecution was himself accused at the Porte of being a Frank, and banished to Etchmiadzin.

Avedick's first act after establishing himself in the Patriarchate was to oust the Patriarch of Jerusalem and consolidate the latter's office with his own. His next was to begin to push the persecution of the papists. At this juncture the three priests from Adrianople, having served a year's sentence at the naval arsenal, had purchased their release, and were in constant communication with the Vartabed (Doctor) Mekhitar Petrossian, of Sivas, a leader of their party, and preacher of the Church of the Illuminator at Galata. Avedick designed to apprehend them all four, when they found asylum in the Latin Monastery of the Capuchins. Unbaffled, the Patriarch cultivated the friendship of the Abbot, Hyacinth, and secured his consent to their surrender. The three priests from Adrianople presented themselves in consequence at the Patriarchate, were cordially received, put in chains, and escaped. Mekhitar fled to Zante, and the Morea.

Mekhitar deserves here more than a passing mention. He had a history. Born at Sivas in 1676, he was ordained at fifteen years of age a Deacon of the Armenian Church. Two years afterward we find him an inmate of the Monastery of the Holy Cross of his native town. On his way to the Holy Places in 1695, at Aleppo, he met a Jesuit Latin Monk, Anthony, apparently of the distinguished French family of Beauvillier, who won him over to Romanism. In 1698 he was in Constantinople preaching for the first time in St. Gregory's of Galata. In the spring of 1699 we find him at Erzrum, engaged in teaching in a monastery there, where also he received his Doctor's staff.

Avedick, then Bishop of Erzurum, admonished him against teaching "heresy." Mekhitar returned to Constantinople, and was once more assigned to preach at St. Gregory's, where we find him at the outbreak of Avedick's persecutions. Mekhitar was then staying at the Capuchin (Franciscan) Monastery adjoining the French Embassy. In 1701 the Ambassador made a futile attempt to bring the two Armenian factions together. Before the end of the year the papal Armenians again were being persecuted, arrested, imprisoned, exiled, their houses raided. Avedick, upon ascending the Patriarchal chair, seems to have attempted to seize Mekhitar with fair promises. Mekhitar in disguise took ship for Smyrna, whence he fled to the Island of Zante.

From thence Mekhitar proceeded to Modon on the Morea, where he settled with fifteen followers in a house provided by the Venetians, and there in 1706 erected a monastery, and later a church. His followers in 1712 were organized into a Benedictine brotherhood. The sojourn on the Morea, however, was to be a brief one. Anticipating the Turkish invasion, in 1715, Mekhitar with eleven of his disciples sailed for Venice, whither word followed them of the capture of Modon and the destruction of their convent by the Moslems. In 1717 the Senate of Venice granted him the Island of St. Lazarus, with its old "Lazaretto" and church, since 1660 the property of the Dominicans of Crete, whither Mekhitar transferred his brotherhood, about eighty men all told. Mekhitar died in 1749. There was a split in the fraternity in 1772, the more conservative faction withdrawing first to Trieste, and afterward to Vienna. In 1789 the brotherhood in Venice installed its own printing press. Such were the beginnings of the Mekhitarist Brotherhood which has done an inestimable service to Armenian learning and letters through the last two hundred years.

But to return to Avedick. The Sultan, on another Austrian War, holding court at Adrianople, the Patriarch spent much time in that city. During his absence from the capital, his Vicar, Vartabed John of Smyrna, personally directed the persecution of papists. Three measures were taken in hand. First, all books recently printed with an underlying papist propaganda motive were burned; secondly, all altars whereupon papists had offered mass, and all pictures that Franks had kissed were discarded, destroyed,

or washed and re-consecrated, and, thirdly, all priests were prohibited to baptize infants of parents unable to establish their orthodoxy, or even to bury such infants except upon payment of heavy fees.

Avedick himself was between two fires. On the one hand he was disliked because he persecuted the papists, on the other because he did not persecute them enough. He must needs at one and the same time keep the good opinion of his own people, of the Sheikh-ul-Islam, Feizullah, who was a sworn enemy of foreigners and all things foreign, of the Abbot Hyacinth, head of the Capuchin Franciscans, and of the French Ambassador, Charles Ferriol, Marquis d'Argental. When in 1703 the Turkish army mutinied, and Mustapha II abdicated in favor of Ahmed III, and Feizullah was slain, the papal Armenian magnates secured Avedick's disgrace, imprisonment, and exile. But the papist triumph was but for a short time. Avedick's friends rallied to him, and secured after fourteen months his restoration, upon the understanding that he would not renew the pursuit of the papists (1704). Once restored to power, however, Avedick soon forgot his promises, putting the screws on some of the "Frank" magnates, and ending by seizing Ferriol's Armenian Dragoman, a papist. The Ambassador through the Porte secured the release of his man, and in threatening terms commanded the Patriarch to reimburse the dragoman for the fines he had caused him to incur. Avedick replied in no diplomatic language, whereupon the Frenchman, supported by thirty papal Armenian magnates, complained to the Grand Vizier. The upshot was that the Patriarch again was dethroned, and exiled to the Island of Tenedos (1706).

Avedick had secured a firman for his own release when Ferriol commenced his machinations to dispose of Avedick once for all. At Chios, the French vice-consul transferred the ex-Patriarch, on his way to Rhodes and Jerusalem, by trickery to a French vessel bound for Messina, where he was detained in a prison of the Inquisition five months. At the hand of a Greek merchant Avedick advised his friends at Constantinople of his whereabouts, Ferriol alone denying knowing anything about him, a denial he

contradicts in letters now extant, in which he says that Father Hyacinth put him up to it all.

Messina not being found a safe place for Avedick, he was transferred thence to Marseilles, where he was incarcerated in the prison of the navy yards, kept for the first forty days in the inner dungeon, his books and papers taken from him (his 188 gold pounds had been filched by the French sea captain), his head and beard shaved, his feet in chains. But Marseilles, too, being deemed not sufficiently secret, Avedick was taken thence to Mont St. Michel, off the northwest coast of France, where he remained for three years, until 1710. Louis XIV promised the Porte faithfully to institute a search for Avedick in Spain and Italy, knowing all the while that the man was a prisoner in his own Belle France, while Pope Clement XI wrote the French monarch letter after letter imploring him to redouble the severities practised on his distinguished prisoner. The pressure of inquiries from Constantinople finally led to Avedick's incarceration in the Bastille, in Paris, at first in an underground dungeon, later in quarters he calls in his memoirs by comparison "purgatory." In the fall of 1710 Avedick gave in his confession of the Catholic faith to the Archbishop of Paris, Louis Antoine, Duke of Noailles, and a few days later was consecrated a priest of Notre Dame, with the right to read Mass every Sunday in the Chapel of the Barefoot Carmelites. Thereafter he lived but nine months or so, dying at the age of fifty-four years, in appearance a very old man, and being buried in the Cemetery of St. Sulpice. In that same year (1711) Ferriol returned insane to France. Such in outline is the story of a man who has figured in both Armenian and French literature, and has even been identified, though wrongly, with "the Man of the Iron Mask," whose death occurred eight years previously (1703).

In 1707 John of Smyrna, formerly Patriarch's Vicar, was placed by the national party on the Patriarchal throne. As Patriarch John pursued Avedick's ways, and outdid his own acts as Vicar. In his reign a priest by the name of Michael of Bergnik, and a Bishop, Melchior Dasbas, were executed at Merdin, the one outright, the other with refinements of cruel torture. At Constantinople, in the course of the government inquest following the kidnapping

of Avedick, a priest of distinguished family, Comitas Keumurjian, named as a leader among the "Frankish" Armenians, was given the choice between Islam and death, and chose the latter, saying, "I will not exchange my gold for copper!" He was beheaded in the Psamatia quarter of the Old City, his body remaining for three days exposed to public view. The Greeks then took charge of it, giving the body a Christian sepulture and preserving the head for a sacred relic. Ferriol at a generous price purchased the head from the Greeks, and the trunk from the Turks, and forwarded them together to France. The net result of these persecutions was that the papal Armenians of the Capital forsook altogether their national churches and resorted to the churches of the Latins.

Yet another persecution raged from 1712 to 1715. Fines, imprisonments, exiles and hard labor at the naval arsenal were again the portion of the papists. In the latter year the Patriarch John of Ganzaca secured an imperial edict authorizing him to place all suspects of papism throughout the empire under arrest. Under this order many of the clergy and laity of Erzurum, the acting Bishop of Trebizond, and a vartabed of Tocat, suffered in one manner and another.

New Julfa

New Julfa in a short time became the most flourishing of the Armenian communities of Persia. It was the seat of a Bishop recognized as the spiritual head of all the Armenians of Persia, India and Java, and holding a charter after the Prophet's reputed original defining the rights and obligations of a Christian community under Shiite law (see Appendix III). The Convent of New Julfa, residence of the Bishop, once had a Library (now robbed of its most valued treasures), and a printing establishment founded by Hachadur of Cesarea in 1641, the first among the Armenians of the world. The present buildings of the Monastery date from the middle of the seventeenth century. The interior walls of the conventual Church are decorated with Bible scenes from the brush of the monk, John of Julfa (died 1715), and by other masters.

The town at one time had a population of 60,000 from various

parts of the mother country, with twenty-four national, and four papal Armenian churches. Religious controversies, as elsewhere, embittered the life of the colony, until in 1709 the Catholicos Alexander I wrote to Pope Clement XI complaining of the Jesuits' misdeeds. Clement's reply afforded little comfort. If the Catholicos would send the Pope credible proof of his orthodoxy and submission, duly sealed by his Bishops, the Pope in turn would issue orders to the Jesuits of Persia to render submission to him! Whereupon the papists were persecuted, and the Jesuits driven out of the land (1711).

About 1715, or shortly before the Afghan invasion (1721), New Julfa boasted two Bishops, seventeen Doctors of the Monastery, all distinguished men, and sixty-two parish priests in its twenty-four national churches. The clergy seem to have been under strict ecclesiastical oversight. A Bishop of Ispahan, who was also Abbot of the Convent of New Julfa otherwise known as St. Savior's, ordained about 1725 that his priests must go on their parochial calls in twos, and must not resort to the bazaars, loaf in shops, or use snuff. Nor was it always the lower clergy that were under surveillance. A Bishop of Ispahan in 1752 was found guilty by four of his associates of unbecoming conduct and deposed, and one of the Bishops deposing him was found two years afterward similarly guilty and was similarly disposed of.

Nadir Shah in 1740 ordered the Hebrew, Christian and Moslem scriptures translated into Persian. For the Christian Gospels, he commissioned certain Armenian Doctors, under chairmanship of George of Julfa, who seem to have followed in their task the earlier work of John of Julfa in a parallel version of the entire New Testament into Persian and Arabic.⁴² The clergy accomplishing the work assigned were remunerated by the Shah with costly caftans and one hundred tomans of money each.

New Julfa gave to the world a remarkably large number of illustrious men. Among these are to be mentioned the Catholicos Jacob IV, the Monk John, painter, writer, New Testament translator, and anti-Jesuit agitator, and last but not least, the lay scholar Emin, of the Lazarian family of Moscow, founders of the Academy of Oriental Languages there. New Julfa's merchants were to be met with in all parts of the world, at Astrakhan, Moscow and all the great cities of western Europe, and in Mesopotamia,

India, Java, China and the Philippines in the East. Following the Afghan invasions and the subsequent period of anarchy, the people of New Julfa, harassed by intolerable exactions of rival khans, fled the country in great numbers, leaving their vacant mansions mute witnesses of a vanished glory. Less than 3,000 of the city's original population now remain.

A phenomenon of popular superstition appearing in this period is not without its own peculiar interest. In the village of Shrushkan, near Ispahan, there long was a manuscript Testament reputed to have wonderful curative properties. The front cover of the volume was surmounted with a cruciform silver casket with a glass lid, the four arms of the cross holding relics of saints, while in the circular compartment in the center was a piece of paper bearing the name of St. Basil of Cesarea. The volume was the property of a family calling themselves "The Gentlemen of the Testament." The book was brought out once a year to New Julfa, making a festive occasion. Pilgrims resorted to it from as far as Bushire and Bassora, even Moslems from over the province of Ispahan coming to seek its healing benefits.

Upon its entry into New Julfa sacrifices of sheep were offered up to it. Pilgrims carried away from it silver crosses, hearts, eyes, tongues and lips, according to the nature of the affection to be cured, and brought them back afterward with duplicates by way of a thank offering. Hired by the owners of the Testament there were sometimes male and female mediums, who rolled on the floor in a trance, beat upon their breasts, pulled at their hair and clawed their faces, and with eyelids closed, still unconscious, rising to their feet, delivered, in the sing-song of a church chant, in cryptic language, to the accompaniment of burning incense, oracles upon the nature and the possible granting of each suppliant's desire.

Shortly after his accession, the Catholicos Alexander I (1706-14) took notice of the wonder-working Testament, objecting to its being used as a source of private revenue, and ordering the fees to be equitably distributed among the priests of the village (1708). At long last, in 1852, the Bishop Thaddeus forbade all pilgrimages to the miraculous Testament, and stopped the flow of gifts to it from devout nationals in India, action which if it did not serve to suppress the cult outright, yet considerably discouraged it.

CHAPTER XIX

HARBINGERS OF A NEW DAY

THE Patriarchate of Constantinople drew to itself in the eighteenth century a succession of great men of whom two at least are noteworthy as administrators. These were John Golod (1715-41), and Zecharias II, of Galzwan (1773-99), whose long terms of office were in themselves a proof of their competency.

Some Great Men

With the accession in 1715 of John Golod the scandalous rivalries for the Patriarchal succession at Constantinople come to an end. He reigned for over twenty-five years, and died in office. No patriarch before him had reigned so long. He again appointed a separate Patriarch for Jerusalem, first step toward the clearing of the indebtedness of the Convent of the Two Saints James there, which since Avedick's time had been but a cure of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and now groaned under heavy obligations contracted by corrupt monks. John also rebuilt many churches, destroyed by frequent fires, itself a difficult undertaking, as each time that a church edifice was erected, rebuilt or repaired, Turkish magnates demanded exorbitant presents. When he ascended the Patriarchal throne, without the customary fees or bribes to Turkish officials, John was only a Vartabed, and but thirty-seven years of age.

The Patriarch Zecharias, of Galzwan, is distinguished as the prelate who introduced modern business methods into the administration. He placed the Patriarchate of Jerusalem on a businesslike footing through the appointment in 1791 of six trustees charged with the keeping of books subject to a periodic auditing. A great fire in Constantinople destroying in 1782 some 30,000 residences and other buildings led Zecharias to raise in conference with some magnates large sums of money to provide tents and food for the sufferers. A committee of sixteen from the seventy-two trade-guilds of the city was placed in charge of the distribution of relief. This was the first great systematic relief venture of the Church in mod-

ern times. Besides the church building operations that in those days became necessary, Zecharias, toward the end of the century founded, with benefactions of Megrditch (Baptist) Amira Mirijanian, a new Hospital at Pera, and repaired and reopened another in the city dating from 1751. The while the Turkish Government ceased not to blackmail its Christian subjects. The wars with Austria and Russia (1787-92) afforded the ready pretext to penalize all native Christians. All the silver plate of the churches in those years was melted down into bullion and surrendered to the Turks.

Zecharias' bequests will serve to indicate both his wealth and interests. After the Government had taken its legal share of 30,000 piastres, and his successor in the Patriarchate another 20,000, his estate was divided as follows: To the Cathedral Church, 20,000; to the Kurucheshmé Church, 18,000; for the bailing of debtor prisoners, 5,000; for the burial of unclaimed dead, 5,000; for the destitute, 1,500; for the saying of mass at Etchmiadzin in memory of his own mother, 5,000; for the wedding expenses of orphaned daughters of priests, 2,500; for parish schools, 1,500; for hospitals, 3,500; and unspecified, 10,000, making a grand total of 72,000 piastres. Zecharias in addition left to the Cathedral Church a prelatical vestment valued at 35,000 piastres.

It was a layman, Harutun Bezjian, born and reared in these times, that at the opening of the following century became the ornament of the Armenian community of Constantinople. Trusted adviser and personal companion of the great Sultan Mahmud, his shrewdness financed Turkey's Russian War, paid the consequent indemnity by foreign loans, secured Russian aid to check an Egyptian invasion, and saved the capital from threatening famine by remitting all taxes on imports of provisions and wheat. Throughout the land he built schools and churches, at the capital the new Cathedral at Kum Kapu, and in 1832 founded the National Armenian Hospital at the Seven Towers. He died early in 1834, aged about sixty-four years, lamented by an entire community, and by the King.

Schools

Next only to the School of Siunik, at the Convent of Datev, in the promotion of the intellectual and religious revival of Armenia,

was the Convent of St John Baptist, at Bitlis. During the incumbency of its Abbot, Basil (died 1615), this convent was rebuilt from its foundations, its school and library both receiving a new lease of life. Into his school Basil introduced the teaching of the "humanities," that is, Grammar, Logic and Philosophy. Under the Abbot Vartan (died 1705), the school was dignified with the name of a "University." Inmates went out in all directions doing "extension" work.

John Golod was a product of this school. On becoming Patriarch of Constantinople he became also a patron of schools at the capital. In schools he there patronized not fewer than twenty-seven high ecclesiastics are said to have received their preparatory training. Nor is this the last time we shall have occasion to mention him in this chapter. Golod's life is many-sided. Hardly in any age was primary education totally neglected among the Armenians; monasteries in their conventual schools occasionally trained youths not headed for the clerical office. But toward the end of the eighteenth century the parochial school emerges. Harutun Bezjian about 1780 was attending the parochial school of the Patriarchate, the first opened, by the Patriarch Zecharias, at the Turkish capital. Others soon followed in the parishes of Balat, Pera, Psamatia, Ortakeuy, Couroucheshmé, and Scutari.

The Bishop of Erzurum, Garabed Ezigian, returning from studies at Constantinople in 1795, had in force in that city down until the Russian invasion of 1828 a system of compulsory education for children in his diocese. To make the system effective he clothed and fed at school between forty and fifty indigent scholars, and distributed home relief to the parents in the city. Under the Constitution of 1863, and following the last Russo-Turkish War, common-school education among Turkish Armenians became practically universal. Associations were formed to promote the movement, under the names of the Eastern, the School Lovers', the Araratian, and the Cilician, all of which in 1879 were merged into the United Societies.

By way of a beginning in higher education, the Patriarch Jacob Nalyan (1741-64) founded a Patriarchal Academy in which he himself taught, and of which the Headmaster was one Baltasar. Many afterward distinguishing themselves in the clerical profes-

sion, among them being the Catholicos Simeon I, received their education here. The institution had a sporadic life. The Patriarch Zecharias reopened it in 1768, educating in it seven future bishops of the Church alone. The Academy, having burnt down in 1826, was reopened in 1829, with the learned Peshtimaljian for Principal. American mission schools soon came in to incite a worthy competitive spirit, but the National College at Scutari, founded in 1838, though under high auspices, proved short-lived through sheer "politics." Later efforts at the capital were more successful. Central College was opened at Pera in 1886. Meantime at Erzurum Sanassarian College was inaugurated (1881). On the faculty of the latter institution were several men trained in Germany.

The higher education among Russian Armenians is represented by the Nersesian Academy, founded by the famous Archbishop Nerses at Tiflis in 1822. A new building was erected in 1908 through the munificence of Alexander Mantashian. Nor should we overlook the Lazarian Academy of Oriental Languages at Moscow, opened under auspices of the Lazarian family in 1816, and chartered by Imperial Ukase in 1825. Under the *Polojenye*, the Catholicos George IV in 1867 designated a central committee on education, and in 1873 diocesan school inspectors. The government in the year following took over the teaching of Russian in Armenian schools.

The education of the clergy as such has demanded a belated but increasing measure of attention. Two deacons about 1890 were sent by the Catholicos Macar I to Germany, Mgrditchian to study Theology, Solomonian (Comitas) church music. An appreciable number of candidates for the Gregorian priesthood in the nineties were attending the American Mission Seminary at Marash, some paying their own way. A theological seminary was inaugurated in 1889 at the Monastery of Armash (founded 1611), near Nicomedia. At the opening of the new century there was a faculty of six, Ormanian being one of the number. Students were limited to thirty. This school was about to graduate its first class, when the World War intervened with its accompaniments of deportation and desolation. Since that war the Monastic School at Jerusalem has done a good work in the training of clergy, enjoying the co-operation of visiting professors from English Universities.

Printing

In reviewing the times of reconstruction we must not overlook the beginnings of printing. To pass by some books printed apparently under private auspices in 1513 at Venice, Abcar of Tocat, agent of the Catholicos Michael I (1567-76), printed in 1566, also at Venice, a *Psalter*. The papal censors found Armenian ritual books unorthodox and refused their imprimatur to other works. Abcar then brought his type to Constantinople, and set up a press on the premises of St Nicholas' Church at Langa, where in 1568 he printed the *Calendar*, *Hymnary*, *Hoursbook* and *Missal*.

Another noteworthy figure in the history of Armenian printing is John of Angora, who in 1637, during the reign of the Catholicos Philip I (1633-55), had cast in Rome a font of type used in printing a *Missal* in Armenian and Latin in double columns. Proceeding thence to Venice, he printed in 1642 in the latter city a *Psalter*, and in the year following Nerses the Graceful's *Jesus*. Simultaneously (1640), Hachadur of Cesarea, Abbot of the Convent of New Julfa, had fonts of type cast, printing the *Hoursbook*, the *Psalter*, and a few minor works.

Upon his accession, the Catholicos Jacob IV, of New Julfa (1655-80), sought for someone to send to Europe to supervise the casting of better type than so far had been available. Matthew of Dzar, a deacon, being commissioned, first proceeded to Venice, then the great printing center, and from thence to Rome, but meeting with opposition from the Papacy, passed over to Protestant Holland. He found a good manufacturer of type at Amsterdam, but met with financial difficulties. At this juncture, one Avedis, an Armenian layman, in Holland on commercial business, rendered welcome financial assistance, making possible the printing in 1660 of Nerses' *Jesus*. While yet engaged on this undertaking, however, Matthew sickened and died. Avedis then assumed the debts contracted, purchased and made a present of the printing shop to the Catholicos, and wrote to his own brother at Etchmiadzin, the Vartabed Osgan, of Ispahan, to hasten to Holland and push the work initiated.

Upon receipt of Avedis' letter the Catholicos issued the formal commission authorizing Osgan to proceed to Holland to under-

take the printing of the Bible, the need of which had long been felt. Garabed Vartabed, a pupil of Osgan, was sent in advance, and upon arrival at Amsterdam took immediate charge of the printing establishment. Osgan himself set forth for Holland in 1662, bearing letters from the Catholicos commending him to the confidence of pious Armenians along the line of his journey.

At Leghorn Osgan found his brother Avedis, and proceeded thence to Rome. In the latter city the few Armenians he met with giving him no encouragement, he returned again to Leghorn, where now he found three merchants of New Julfa, Stephen, Theodore and Peter, who offered to loan him money without interest. With funds thus borrowed the first printed edition of the Armenian Bible was produced at Amsterdam in 1666-68. But even after the books were in print, not everything was propitious. One ship load of Bibles and Hymn Books sank on its way to Constantinople, and the sales were slow. Furthermore Osgan's Bible was a Latinized edition, following the Vulgate, and the Pope's agents besides everywhere sedulously stressed its having been printed in a heretical country. The latter complaint indeed led to Osgan's transferring his printing establishment to Marseilles, where he died in 1674. Some years afterward (1695-1704), however, a number of books again are printed at Amsterdam, among them the *History of Moses of Khorni*, the *Imitation of Thomas à Kempis*, the *Gospels*, and the *Church Hymnal*, besides an excellent *Wall-Map of the World*.

In the new century John Golod (1715-41) supervised the printing at Constantinople of upward of ninety volumes of the old Armenian writers, including Gregory of Datev's *Book of Questions*, a quarto volume, in coarse print, of over 800 pages of two columns each. Meantime, in 1729, the Mekhitarists founded their press at Venice. The Catholicos Simeon I succeeded in starting a printing establishment at Etchmiadzin in 1771, after meeting with all sorts of difficulties in securing matrices, type, paper stock and workmen, an Armenian merchant of New Julfa resident at Madras financing the undertaking. A paper factory followed in 1776, a year made also memorable by Simeon's placing on his Calendar, to spite the papists, the names of John of Vorodn and Gregory of Datev. In 1889 the printery of Etchmiadzin was

housed in a building of its own. In 1895 a Concordance of the Old and New Testaments, by the Vartabed Thaddeus Egavianz, was published by the Sts. James Press at Jerusalem.

Russia and the Polojenye

From the first Armenians were accorded equal rights with all members of the Russian Orthodox Church. Peter the Great in 1719 instructed the Russian clergy to deny to no Armenian the ordinances of their Church. In 1734 the Empress Anne gave to all Armenians the right to maintain their own churches and creeds, a right confirmed by the Empress Elizabeth in 1744, and by Catherine the Great in 1763. In 1770 Armenian churches were erected in Moscow and Petersburg.

From the beginning of the eighteenth century more and more the Armenians turn their eyes to Peter the Great and Russia for their deliverance. Peter in 1723 issued a friendly proclamation to the Armenians, followed by his capture of Terek, Derbent and Baku. When in the following year the Turks according to previous agreement with him occupied Erivan, and the Armenians protested that he had disappointed them in their desire to come under a Christian government, he told them to migrate to Russian territory.

Erivan in 1735 fell again to Nadir Shah's Persians, who carried off 7,000 Georgian and Armenian captives of both sexes and all ages. Again in 1795, at the capture of Tiflis, the Persians slew all adult males, and carried off 16,000 Georgian and Armenian children. Two years later the Governor of Erivan, the Shah's own brother, ordered a search made for him for comely Armenian girls, an order that the Catholicos Lucas I could thwart only by directing, despite the Lenten season, when normally weddings are not allowed, all girls eight years of age and upward to be married. In view of such conditions we are not surprised to find the Catholicos Jacob V in 1760, when Persia was torn by civil war, writing to the Empress Elizabeth soliciting her interest in the distressed Armenian and Georgian peoples, nor that at last, in 1801, Georgia becomes a Russian province.

At the turn of the century, following the death of the Catholicos Lucas I (1799), the Russian Ambassador at Constantinople, Basil

Tamaroff, and his immediate successors in office, began to take an interest in the elections of the Armenian Catholicici. As a result the death of Lucas was followed by a three-cornered contest over the succession, involving three empires, and three candidates. Of these Joseph Arghutian was one. Armenian Archbishop of All Russia, he was the choice of the Tzar Paul, and of George XII, last King of Georgia, and second choice of the monks at Etchmiadzin. The Turkish government secretly opposed him. He died opportunely at Tiflis on his way to Etchmiadzin for consecration. A second candidate was Daniel, Patriarch of Constantinople, choice of the people at the Turkish capital, and first choice of the monks at Etchmiadzin, who, following a popular tumult, was exiled by the Turkish government to Tenedos, and four months afterward permitted to proceed to Tocat to take charge of that diocese. The third candidate was David, of Tiflis, Legate of Etchmiadzin, who while at the Turkish capital had hoped to follow Daniel in the Patriarchate, but worming himself meantime into the good graces of the Armenian magnates, now returned to Etchmiadzin, and having bribed the Persian Khan of Erivan heavily, seized the Catholicate, and under the shelter of Persian lances caused himself to be consecrated Catholicos (1801).

No sooner installed in the pontifical chair than David addressed himself to the task of subjugating the monks of the Convent, which he proceeded to do like an oriental jailer and hangman. The new Tzar, Alexander I, now convinced that David was the wrong man for the place, instructed his Turkish Ambassador to secure the withdrawal of the Porte's sanction of him. Meantime the Khan of Erivan was reprimanded by his own government for the part he had played in putting David in power. In this situation a Synod of Bishops and monks met on Turkish soil, at Utch Kilissé, the ancient Shahabivan, and consecrated Daniel as the legitimate Catholicos, a course of action for which the ecclesiastical canons were duly cited. There thus came into existence in 1802 two rival Catholicici.

It so transpired that Gregory, the then occupant of the Patriarchal chair of Constantinople, was a man of singular indiscretion of speech, and certain intemperate language he employed in public discourse against David presently compassed his downfall.

His successor, a partisan of David, promptly sent the indiscreet ex-Patriarch and his Vicar, together with the rival Catholicos Daniel, still on Turkish soil, into exile at Etchmiadzin, into the very hands of their foe! David immured them all three in the fortress of Erivan, where the Patriarchal Vicar was starved to death.

During a war with Russia the Persian government removed the Catholicos Daniel to Tabriz (1804), and afterward to Maragha. David is said to have expended large sums of money to secure his rival's execution in exile. At last in 1807, upon joint representations of Russia and Turkey, the Shah placed the rightful claimant on the pontifical throne, the Khan of Erivan arranging for Daniel, now a broken old man, to ride in state to his See, while David trudged ahead of him, barefoot and uncovered, to such fate as his now successful rival might designate. Daniel magnanimously declined to execute this order, permitting his humiliated foe to ride as an equal by his side. Alas that in the following year Daniel died at Erivan, whither he again had been removed, this time in anticipation of a Russian occupation of Etchmiadzin, while David lived out the rest of his life in comfort.

But Daniel had not lived in vain. While in captivity at Maragha, impressed with the unwisdom of leaving absolute powers in the hands of any Catholicos, he laid down in a pontifical Bull the first outlines of a plan for a "Synod" to share with the Catholicos his administrative authority (1806). Nerses, who upon Daniel's coming to power became his right-hand man, by whom also in 1808 he was ordained to the high office of a Bishop, took the proper steps to organize such a Synod, limiting and regulating the powers of the Catholicos, and rendering thus impossible for the future such unseemly events as the world recently had witnessed. Daniel died in the same year. In 1812 when Henry Martyn passed through Etchmiadzin, Nerses was president of the Synod he had organized.

By the Treaty of Turkmanchai, of 1828, bringing a protracted war with Persia to an end, Russia acquired a sizable portion of northern Armenia, consisting of the provinces of Nakhichevan and Erivan, and including the seat of the Catholicos, Etchmiadzin, followed by the acquisition in the ensuing year, by the Treaty of

Adrianople with Turkey of all the Armenian territory to the westward, including the towns of Gumri (now Leninakan), Kars, Ardahan, Akhaltzik and Akhalkalak, each time with a large access of an immigrant Armenian population. But far from inaugurating ideal conditions in the Church, the Russian occupation introduced its own problems, and did not prevent unworthy men creeping into the highest pontifical office. In 1833 things again were not going very well at Etchmiadzin. A committee of eight of the Synod submitted in that year to the Catholicos John VIII (1831-42) a writ of complaint, demanding the re-establishment of the synodal form of government then in virtual abeyance, the ordaining of no bishops without Synod's consent, the rendering of an account of the financial transactions of the Holy See, and the returning to Tiflis of a mistress the Catholicos kept in town!

The Russian Governor-General of the Caucasus, Baron Rosen, judged the Catholicos, despite all his faults and unpopularity, nay by virtue of them, capable of serving well the Tzarist Government's purpose. So when the foregoing complaint was communicated to him in copy, he concluded to remove not the Catholicos, but the complainants, while at the same time deciding to place the Catholicate by statute under Government supervision.

Under these circumstances came into being the *Polojenye*, signed by the Emperor Nicholas I in 1836, and put into effect at the beginning of the following year. This instrument placed the "Synod" of Etchmiadzin under the titular presidency of the Russian Emperor, and made its decrees subject to review by a resident military "Procurator" representing him. No member of the Holy Synod could be disciplined, and no diocesan Bishop removed, without the Emperor's consent. The Emperor was to select the Catholicos from a list of nominees of the ecumenical delegates in ecclesiastical convention assembled, and members of the Holy Synod and Diocesan Bishops in Russian territory from a list of nominees of the Catholicos. These provisions remained in force until the late Revolution in Russia declared the Church "free."

It is to be observed that, contrary to the spirit and practice of the Armenian Church, the *Polojenye* vested government in the clergy, there being no lay representation provided for except at

the election of the highest dignitary of the Church, and even then clerical delegates being in the majority. In fact elections, government relations, administration, justice and education, all alike are placed in the hands of the clergy. Which suits well enough a man of Ormanian's prelatical leanings. "Nor should we omit saying that for ecclesiastical reform the *Polojenye* has been more effective among the Russian Armenians than has the *Constitution* among the Turkish."⁴³ It is to be observed that the jurisdiction of the Holy Synod of Etchmiadzin did not extend beyond the bounds of the Russian Empire.

Constitutional Government in Turkey

While in Russian Armenia things were gradually shaping up for a new age, the Armenians of Turkey also by degrees were adjusting themselves to changing world conditions. So early as 1815 the Bishop, afterward Patriarch, Paul, proposed to take the selection of the Patriarch of Constantinople out of the hands of individuals and to place it in the hands of a special Council composed of magnates and representatives of the guilds. Like the *Polojenye* in Russia, the Constitution in Turkey followed a Government original. It was the promulgation, by the Sultan Abdul Medjid, of the Hatti Sherif of Gulhané (1839), that afforded the starting point for that twenty years' contest ultimately leading to the establishment of constitutional government in the Armenian "nation" of the Turkish Empire. The new freedom promised by the Hatti Sherif encouraged the common people to contend for their own rights without fear of cruel reprisals. The Patriarch Jacob, to rival a mission institution of the Americans, recently had opened a National College in the suburb of Scutari. The magnates cut off its revenues, forced its closure, and compelled Jacob to go into retirement. It was all very simple. But now the people stepped in and demanded the right to manage their own school and community affairs. A contest of wits followed between the magnates on the one hand and the representatives of the trade guilds on the other (1841). The magnates at this time were still a powerful moneyed aristocracy, dangerously influential at the Porte. So late as 1842 the first Government Board of Finance was created, with two departments, the Asiatic and the European,

each under six magnates, all of them Armenians. The conflict raged through a term of years with varying fortunes, the magnates, as in all cases where an ignorant democracy clashes with a plutocracy, being on the whole the winners, until an educated middle class composed mostly of professional men who had imbibed constitutional ideas at French Universities, stepped in to compose the quarrel.

Through the establishment in 1847 of two Councils, an Ecclesiastical and a Civil, presided over by the Patriarch and elected by the people, the trades unions at Constantinople once more seemed to come to their own, a practical beginning being made in constitutional government. The Patriarch (afterward Catholicos) Matthew, indeed by an intrigue of the magnates, was forced out of office. But if the magnates could still intrigue with impunity, no less could the masses now raid the Patriarchate without danger to their necks. And raid the Patriarchate they did, demanding and securing the reinstatement of the former Patriarch Jacob (1848). A formal election lent to the event the semblance of constitutionality.

Twelve years elapsed. A new charter of rights, the Hatti Humayun, and the Treaty of Paris, following the Crimean War, together placed popular constitutional rights in the Turkish Empire under international guarantees. A Constitutional Assembly of the Armenian Community, on May 24, 1860, gave its sanction to the articles of a National Constitution, revised and ratified by the Turkish Government in 1863.

This instrument made all civil-ecclesiastical offices, from that of the Patriarch down, elective, and regulated the conduct of community affairs in such a way that arbitrary methods on the part of aristocracy and officialdom would become impossible, and lawless demonstrations on the part of the populace unnecessary. A National Assembly was provided for, consisting of 220 representatives, 160 to be elected by the Metropolitan parishes, and 60 by the provincial dioceses. Members of an Ecclesiastical and a Civil Council, and of all Executive Committees, together with a limited number of outstanding professional men and dignitaries, were to be *ex officio* members of the General Assembly. The Constitution among other things stipulated that the clergy should

render their services free of charge, the Church providing stated allowances, a regulation to this day rarely systematically carried out in any part of the Church.

The Turkish Armenian Constitution, never entirely suppressed even by Abdul Hamid's government,⁴⁴ effected in the Community great changes for the better, and it stands largely to its credit that, in the second half of the nineteenth century, the Armenian Church and clergy in the Ottoman Empire reached a degree of advancement never perhaps reached in any other age since that of Isaac and Mesrop.⁴⁵

Evangelization

We have seen how the Monastery of Datev early in the seventeenth century became a center of a new evangelism. Its influence spread over Armenia, and to that influence was owing the evangelistic zeal of such men as John Golod and Gregory of Shirwan, two kindred spirits who lived out their apprenticeship in monasteries of Bitlis and Mush. Every winter they set forth to preach in the churches over the country, "going about (says Golod) in wintry weather, laboriously proclaiming the word of God wherever the Spirit willed and prospered, returning again at the return of spring to the holy sanctuary." This was a way of arranging the time of young preachers that American missionaries in the last century also found convenient.

Golod was a man of evangelical leanings, though one scarcely would know he had ever heard of Luther. In the little that has come down to us from his pen, almost entirely in the nature of colophons to works he caused to be translated from the Latin, there is never a word about the saints or their intercession, much about Christ and his Divine Mediatorship. Golod in a later age very easily could have been accused of Protestant leanings. The other, Gregory of Shirwan, once Abbot at Mush, and in the last thirty-two years of his life Patriarch of Jerusalem, is best known as "Gregory of the Chain," from the heavy shackles that for eight years (1718-26) he carried about his neck while engaged in soliciting funds to pay off a debt of the Convent of Jerusalem.

Armenian scholars have not been without their contributions to Bible translation for other peoples and tongues. Passing by that

parallel version of the New Testament in Persian and Arabic by John of Julfa, which never saw print, two of the most important initial modern translations of the scriptures were made at the hands of Armenian scholars. Toward the latter part of the seventeenth century Jeremias Keumurjian (died 1695), a learned layman of Constantinople, familiar with Greek, Latin, Arabic and Turkish, under the auspices of Ali Bey, a Turkish court official of Polish extraction, translated the entire New Testament and a good part of the Old into the Turkish language. His manuscript, preserved in the Leyden Library, was revised, completed, and published in 1819. In the first quarter of the nineteenth century (1804-22), another Armenian, John Lazarian, from the Portuguese port of Macao, China, under auspices of the Englishman, Claudius Buchanan, rendered the entire Bible into Chinese, publishing it at Calcutta. Both these translations were made from the ancient Armenian, the second, however, being afterward revised from the original languages by the Baptist missionary Marshman, of Serampore.⁴⁸

Three Jews of Constantinople, through contact with British missionaries, were converted in 1826 to Christianity and sent by the government to the naval arsenal to work in a chain gang. One of them weakened and returned to Judaism, while the others, after two years of detention, were granted the royal pardon and permitted to go into the Armenian Church (1828). Fourteen others, converts of the American Mission to the Jews, were baptized at a later date privately by Armenian priests. The magnate Bezjian put a stop to the practice, however, as being one likely to involve the Church in grave political complications.

CHAPTER XX

THE PAPAL DEFECTION

THE Patriarch John Golod entertained an honest desire to settle the papal problem amicably. Ignore it entirely he could not, though under other conditions discretion might have commended this course. The community was in a constant ferment through the papists' attending the foreigners' churches. He asked them to attend their own, at least on Sundays and Holidays, and sought to this end the co-operation of the Latin Bishop of the city. But the papists balked.

Sporadic Persecutions

Under pressure from his own magnates John then represented to Damad Ibrahim Pasha, Son-in-Law to the Sultan and Grand Vizier, that the papists of his flock refused to attend his churches, and rendered allegiance to a Latin Bishop (1720). This brought a royal edict to bastinado or send to the naval arsenal all such Armenians as did not conform. The consequent persecution spread over the empire as far as Aleppo, Diarbekir, Angora, Tocat, Baiburt, Pasen, Erznga and Erzurum. At the capital itself constables were stationed at street corners in the vicinity of Latin churches to apprehend all Armenians thither bound. Once more the papists were placed under the ban, and denied the ordinances of the Church (1720-22).

In 1727 matters appeared in a more hopeful light. The Patriarch, and with him the new Catholicos, Garabed II, of Zeitun (1726-29), on a visit at Constantinople, agreeing to the omission from the Liturgy of the anathema against the Fourth Ecumenical Council and Pope Leo the Great, the papists on their part made a beginning of returning to the national churches. But the attitude of the Pope, Benedict XIII, dissipated all hopes of a conciliation. The Catholicos, upon request of the Latin Bishop, had written to the Pope bespeaking his approval of the steps taken toward peace. But the Pope in his reply, while commending the Catholicos' motives, laid down such conditions for a reconciliation as the latter could not accept. The result was that the papists once more re-

ceived instructions from their spiritual advisers to stay away from the national churches, or to venture no farther in than the outer courts.

The Armenians replied by securing a royal rescript to arrest all papal Armenian priests, and to picket foreign churches with the object of apprehending once more any of their own laity thither resorting (1733). Multitudes now were arrested, imprisoned, and fined, until the French and Prussian Ambassadors protested, and the Grand Vizier, Ali Pasha, interfered.

The French Ambassador, the Marquis de Villeneuve, now sought to secure a church edifice for the special use of the papal Armenians of the Pera Quarter. One hundred and twenty purses of gold (60,000 piastres), besides much jewelry, in two weeks' time was collected for the purpose. The Latin clergy, however, antagonized the project, fearing, it was said, it would empty their own churches. Meantime the Armenian magnates got wind of it, and several lay leaders of the movement were sent to prison and the naval arsenal. The papist magnates thereupon went into conference to seek a way out. It was decided that papal Armenians should avoid resorting to the Latin churches openly or in groups, should attend occasionally the national churches, and should not use abusive language of them. By mediation of the French Ambassador a royal Firman also was secured commanding the two factions henceforth to keep the peace (1736).

If an edict of a Moslem Emperor could restore peace in a Christian communion, this certainly should have done it. The French Ambassador, to help along the good cause, lent the weight of his own personal influence. He gave a dinner at his Embassy to the Patriarch, John Golod, the latter's oldtime friend, Gregory of the Chain, Patriarch of Jerusalem then at the capital, the Legate of the Catholicos, Peter of Romgla, and Armenian magnates of both parties, a social event that he followed up with a personal visit to the Church of St Gregory in Galata, in company with his wife and son and French notables of the city, and later with ecclesiastical processions which he sponsored in demonstration of goodwill and harmony between Armenians and Latins.

Continued Unrest

Meanwhile (1735) the papists had seized four of the seven churches of Angora. The Catholics of Aleppo, at the beginning of 1739, likewise secured for a time a church in which the Governor granted them the privilege to perform their own rites. In view of these precedents, in 1741 the papists at the capital also aspired to take over the Church of St George at Psamatia, and the Church of St Gregory at Galata, raising a fund to buy the consent of Turkish officials. The attempt served only to arouse the dominant spirit of persecution once more. Having received no reply to their petition to the Patriarch Jacob Nalyan (1741-49, 1752-64), "Either give us churches of our own, or grant us permission to worship in the Latin churches," the papal Armenians had proceeded to hold mass in three various churches of the Latins, and in private residences and khans. The last-named practice, permitted to Latins under the Capitulations, but illegal for subjects of the Porte, served now as the cause for more fines, imprisonments and tortures. The French Ambassador also was prevailed upon by the nationalists to withdraw his support of the papal Armenians. In time the four churches of Angora also were restored to the national party (1744).

In 1761 a priest of Palu, by the name of Manuel, tendered to the Sultan, Mustapha III, a petition wherein he stated that many in the Armenian community had turned Franks, that they were attending and enriching with their gifts the churches of the Latins, and that with the co-operation of the foreign ambassadors they were oppressing their brethren who were loyal subjects of the Sultan. Manuel, securing officers from the Government, entered St Peter's, at Pershembé Bazar, and St George's at Galata, both Latin churches, and seized over fifty persons found there attending services illegally, whom he cast into jail at the naval arsenal.

Eventually Manuel himself was sent into exile as a dangerous agitator, but ere then, as a result of his activities, it had become already so difficult for the head of the community to steer an even course between the factions, that upon Nalyan's retirement in 1764 there scarcely could be found a man to accept the post of

Patriarch. Only by a most earnest appeal to his conscience did Nalyan prevail upon Gregory Basmadjian (1764-73) to consent to succeed him. "If," said he, "you do not take this office, some unfit person or other surely will slip into it and wreck the peace of the nation, as has been done so often before, and in the sight of God you will be the one responsible for it!" Under this patriarch things went smoothly for a while, especially as the French Ambassador, Guignard, taking occasion from the arrest at Akhaltzik of some Latin priests as disturbers of the peace, issued a circular letter to all Latin clergy in Turkey warning them against meddling with the Armenians' faith.

Zecharias (1773-99) was on the patriarchal throne when the Catholicos Simeon canonized John of Vorodn and Gregory of Datev (1777), thus sowing seeds for future dissension between papists and nationals. Soon the papists of Constantinople lodged a complaint with the Government representing that their Patriarch, Zecharias, was a Persian citizen, and begging to be set up as an independent community (1778). Zecharias called a general Council to deal with the emergency. The Council authorized him to suppress Catholicism and pacify the community in his own way, stressing per contra that the Catholics were Franks, frequenting the churches of the Latins, and receiving the latter's priests into their homes for illegal services. To enable him to estimate the papists' numerical strength Zecharias instructed his parish priests to bring him lists of Catholics in their several parishes. It was thus discovered that some thirty-five of the Armenian clergy at the capital were papal-minded. Zecharias then called a select meeting of the papists and asked those present to sign a paper professing loyalty to the Church. The papists declared verbally they were in every way loyal, but refused to sign any paper. After Easter the Patriarch forbade his clergy to afford papal Armenians the consolations of religion, and later when the plague made the burying of the dead a prompt necessity, instructed burials of papists to be made without pomp or ceremony. On such occasions mob violence was not uncommon. Otherwise the persecution is said to have been in moderate form, easy penitence bringing prompt forgiveness.

Changes in the Turkish ministry with all the accompanying

intrigues of the papists failed to change the situation for them. Mehmed Zilifdar Pasha, nicknamed the Black Vizier, became Prime Minister in 1779. The papists got his ear, and promised him 500 purses if he would secure their recognition as a separate community with their own Patriarch and churches. In this aspiration they were supported by the foreign Ambassadors, notably that of France, Guignard. But the France of the present no longer was the France of Louis XIV. The French Revolution was impending. And Zilifdar died in 1781.

In 1782 Zecharias, returning from a temporary retirement, ruled through a specially called Council against all marriages between nationals and papists. The regulation only further emphasized the rent in the community.

Events of 1809-28

In the spring of 1809 the Greeks made their last of several attempts to appropriate the Monastery at Jerusalem which the Caliph Omar, upon taking the city, had by royal edict granted to the Armenians, and in the possession of which they had been confirmed by an edict of Sultan Selim I in the fifteenth century. In 1813 the title of the Armenians to the Monastery, with other property rights, was confirmed in perpetuity by an Imperial Firman of Sultan Mahmud, a consummation toward which the loyal co-operation of some papal magnates materially contributed.

Through the *rapprochement* born of this co-operation of the factions, the religious controversy also now came to the fore, raising high hopes of a friendly solution. Once more the demands of the papists being asked, their magnates submitted the well-known five points, viz.: (1) The two natures and wills; (2) the *Filioque* clause; (3) the doctrine of purgatory; (4) the supremacy of the Pope of Rome; (5) the sacrament of extreme unction. The anathema against the Fourth Ecumenical Council and Pope Leo the Great, and the canonization of Gregory of Datev and other moderns likewise came in for their share of attention. The result, however, showed that it was impossible for the two factions to agree on these points, and a popular tumult was the sole reward of those who had sought peace (1810).

Convinced of the impossibility of a reconciliation, the papists

now proceeded to proselytize with a will, counting that in converting an Armenian to their views they saved a soul from death and covered a multitude of sins. Soon growing again bolder, they renewed former attempts to seize churches at Angora and Trebizond (1817).

The Patriarch Paul (1815-23) called a meeting of his Council composed of clergy, magnates and craftsmen to confer on the situation, and was granted authority to deal with it at his own discretion. Accordingly, six days afterward, he called together at the Patriarchate the magnates of both factions and laid upon their hearts the need of peace. The papal magnates asked to be allowed twenty days in which to prepare for a conference Paul proposed to compose the controversy. Paul himself by a patriarchal decree appointed a committee of eight, one of them a layman, to meet with a similar committee of the opposite faction to discuss doctrinal differences, naming the authorities to be followed in the deliberations, viz.: The Bible, the five Ritual Books, the writings of St Gregory, and the General Epistle of Nerses the Graceful. He also laid down the principles that were to govern the interpretation of the authorities named. First of all, the plain intention of each writer was to be sought out, the primary and ordinary meaning of words being accepted; dark passages were to be construed with such patristic help as was available, but without violence to the latter's ipsissima verba through use of later exegetical comment modifying or altering the meaning.

It soon appeared, however, that the papal clergy had no intention to attend any such conference as was proposed. Whereupon the Patriarch summoned a popular meeting of both factions, fifty representatives of as many crafts being present from the papists alone, and laid the situation before them. The Catholic tradesmen, thoroughly aroused, assembled over 300 of their own faction in the Latin Church of the Holy Trinity at Pera, and cited their clergy before the assembly, calling them to task for their evasive conduct. This meeting was broken up by the parish authorities.

Hardly had the popular excitement incident to these events subsided when the Porte once more found occasion to meddle in the community's doctrinal controversies. A certain papal Armenian family by the name of Duzian at this time was in charge of the

Royal Mint. Through an intrigue of Halet Effendi, Sultan's Privy Counsellor, and deadly foe of all Christians, the Duzians were disgraced on a charge of embezzlement, three brothers and an uncle executed, and sixteen others of their connection exiled. The family's properties were forfeited to the crown, everything being sold at auction to satisfy alleged obligations. During a search incident to these confiscations altars were discovered in the Duzians' homes for the celebration of the Mass. The question of dissent in the Armenian community thus once again opened, Paul was strictly instructed by the government to eradicate the causes of discord (1819). In the labors that ensued to bring about the result the Porte desired, Gregory Balian, King's Architect, and Harutun Bezjian, who had succeeded the Duzians at the Imperial Mint, took an active hand.

In January, 1820, the Patriarch asked every papist to sign the following brief confession: "Whatsoever the Holy Orthodox Armenian Church, from the time of our own St Gregory the Illuminator until the present, accepts, I also accept, and whatsoever it rejects, I too reject. In witness of this my true confession I hereunto voluntarily have affixed my signature and seal." As many were unwilling to sign this paper, later, to make matters easier, the Nicene Creed was substituted.

Meanwhile two committees of three each debated together the aforementioned five points, and after a six weeks' protracted conference succeeded in drawing up a statement vindicating the substantial orthodoxy of the Armenian positions. On March 8 Paul called a meeting of his mixed Council, of clergy and laity, to act upon the conference's findings, which were duly endorsed. The papists then pressed some further demands, involving the anathema against the Fourth Ecumenical Council and Pope Leo the Great, and later ecumenical councils, and the canonization of Gregory of Datev and the other moderns, demands on which, however, Paul was unyielding. It appeared as if things must come to a deadlock, when in their turn the papists appealed to Halet Effendi, forcing upon him the singular role of mediator between Christian factions. Halet understood that the papists' demands in no way involved the essentials of the faith, and secured from Mahmud a writ commanding the Patriarch to come to terms

with his opponents. Paul acceded with alacrity if not good grace, called another Council, and amicably settled the later points raised. The findings of the joint commission, as thus revised, were incorporated in a document entitled, *An Invitation to Love*, which was ordered printed and broadcast in the community.

It seemed all that now remained to do was to secure the papists' attendance at the national churches! The Mekhitarist fathers, however, who of all the papal clergy had taken the sole active part in the late negotiations for reunion, declined to return to the bosom of the national Church so long as there were in the city some sixty of the Romanist clergy, or three times their own number, and 27,000 of their flock, who as yet had not been heard from. The nationals therefore gathered signatures to a paper affirming that so far as they were concerned the reunion was now complete. The document was handed in to Halet Effendi, who thereupon secured from the Sultan an order sending the papists back to the fold. Accordingly on the third day of Easter, April 23, in one of the Chapels adjoining the Patriarchal Cathedral at Kum Kapu, two papist candidates were ordained to the priesthood, all anathemas against the Fourth Council and Pope Leo being omitted from the service, and the event later signalized by various social and ecclesiastical functions. It seemed to matter but little that the Latin Bishop of Constantinople, and the Pope's Armenian Vicar, instigated by the irreconcilables, together launched hot excommunication against all those returning to the Armenian Church.

Things, however, assumed a grave aspect when late in July the Patriarch Paul, in carrying out one of the conditions of the plan of union, consecrated holy oil for use in the administration of extreme unction. The common people, only puzzled by the subtleties of doctrine, watched with a jealous eye all innovations in the rites of the Church, and this one did not escape their notice. That faction of the papists also who were opposed to the reunion on any terms, kept exasperating the nationals with their sarcasms: "If now you will only mention the Pope in your Liturgy, you will be perfect Catholics!" The atmosphere became thus charged with discontent and discord, awaiting only the flame of a match for an explosion.

Soon the provocation was forthcoming. On the 19th day of August, a man of Angora, like all his papist townsmen fanatically opposed to the reunion, bearing in his hand a copy of the *Invitation to Love*, in which he had replaced a frontispiece of the Illuminator with a portrait of the Pope, went the rounds of the shops of the Cesarean shoe-makers, bigoted nationals of the opposite faction, denouncing the Patriarch everywhere for having turned Catholic, as evidenced by the portrait which he displayed, and stressing the unseemly innovation of substituting the Patriarch's own olive-oil for the Holy Muron of Etchmiadzin. As a result on the ensuing day, a Sunday, hundreds of men poured down the hill to the Patriarchal Church, and congregating at the Chapel in which the recent ordinations had been held, vociferated, "We have learned our Patriarch has turned Frank, and fain would turn us also! We will not turn Franks; we are Armenians! Where is our Patriarch?" Two Bishops that Paul sent down to pacify the rioters were beaten up by the mob, who then made a rush for the Patriarchal offices, battered down the doors, and instituted a hunt for the high prelate. Meantime Paul had absconded by a window to the asylum of an adjoining Moslem residence. Notified by the Patriarch's Vicar, the Agha of the Janissaries arrived upon the scene with a regiment of his troops. Some of the rioters were placed under arrest, the balance scattered, and for two weeks a guard left to maintain order.

On Monday some of the shoe-makers' trade having cooled off handed in a written petition to the Grand Vizier. "You are rather late doing this!" rebuked that dignitary, and put them all in jail. The magnates then were summoned to the Porte, and questioned on the merits of the people's complaint, and on "this holy oil" that had been making so much trouble. The reply was that there were no complaints whatever against the Patriarch, which was duly recorded. The *Invitation to Love* then was rendered into Arabic, the literary language of the Porte, and the Government assured the Patriarch in no wise had, as alleged, transferred his allegiance to the Pope of Rome.

Who then was responsible for the recent riot? The Patriarch was instructed to discover the instigators. He tried, but the man of Angora was nowhere found. He had fled the country. The

Patriarch's decrees were impotent further to uncover the guilt. The Government itself then took matters in hand. The Turk judged that if the guilty could not be apprehended, confessions of guilt could readily be wrung from such as preferred instant death to protracted torture, and the royal wrath demanded a scapegoat. Torture was applied therefore to those in jail. Several victims thus were secured. On the 18th of September, 1820, Gregory Sakayan, a hapless octogenarian, was brought at vespers to the door of the Patriarchal Church and there beheaded. Another victim was decapitated along the main avenue of the old city, under the column of Constantine, now known as the "Hooped Column" or Chemberli Tash. Two others, having turned Moslems under torture, were hanged in Turks' clothes at Parmak Kapu, and yet another, a coffee-house keeper, in front of his own place of business in Psamatia. Five magnates besides were condemned to exile for having "meddled" in the community's affairs. One of them turned Moslem to escape the penalty. Another, one not less than Bezjian himself, suffered a year's exile, afterward being made, first keeper of the Privy Purse, then overseer of the Imperial Mint, rising ever steadily in the Sultan's favor. Such are a few sidelights on the methods of the great Sultan Mahmud who, in the fashion of the oriental despot that he was, had his own barbarous way of suppressing a Greek revolt, destroying his Janissaries, or restoring order in a Christian community.

What to do with the Mekhitarist fathers who had come into the Church was the next question to the fore. Paul proposed to send them away from the capital, two to Etchmiadzin, two to Mush, and three to Jerusalem. The men, however, upon learning of this design, took refuge in the Latin churches, performed penance, and returned to the Church of Rome, taking back with them their lay following. Nothing remained behind in the national Church but a rankling desire for revenge, which soon enough found the opportunity to vent itself.

Emancipation

The Romanist Armenians had had a Papal Vicar at the office of the Latin Bishop of Constantinople since 1758. Anthony Nuriyan, a papist Vartabed, in 1827, was appointed Vicar at the

Patriarch's own office, to represent the papal faction at national headquarters, with the consent of the Patriarch Garabed (1823-31), and through the initiative of Harutun Bezjian, then chairman of the National Executive Council. Naturally this step but led to more determined efforts on the part of the papists to secure a Patriarch of their own. Bezjian himself, the far-seeing statesman that he was, could not have failed to foresee this. It was only unfortunate that the papists once more to gain their end the more speedily resorted to their old-time intrigues. The two Tengerian brothers, leaders in the papal faction, represented to the Sultan that they were loyal subjects of his government, whereas the loyalty of the nationals was in doubt, and that in the event of a war with Russia, such as Persia then was passing through, the papists' only safety would lie in being segregated from the nationals.

Mahmud was gravely disturbed. He sent for Bezjian to ask his advice. Bezjian told the Sultan the latter could readily reassure himself through the Patriarch. That prelate accordingly was summoned to the Palace. In the event of a war with Russia, he was asked, could he guarantee to the King his people's good conduct? Certainly, Your Majesty, replied Garabed, we can, by virtue of the confessional to which all nationals resort; but for the papal Armenians who never confess to our priests, we cannot be responsible. The noose which the papists had made ready for the nationals was beginning to tighten about their own necks. And first of all the Tengerian brothers themselves with their families went into exile.

Subsequent to the naval battle of Navarino (October 20, 1827), Mahmud, having expelled the Ambassadors of the Powers, felt himself released from all considerations of international policy in his treatment of the papal Armenians, and dealt with them accordingly. An order now was dispatched to the Patriarchate to the following effect, viz.: (1) All Angorans were to be sent off with their families to their native city; (2) all other papal Armenians, whether natives of the capital or of the provinces, refusing submission to the Patriarch, were to be banished to various cities of Asia Minor; (3) all papal priests, wherever residing, were to be expelled from the country; (4) all papal nuns were to be

banished to points in European Turkey; (5) papists left in Constantinople were not to be permitted to reside in foreign quarters or suburbs of the city where there were Latin churches, and if they owned property there, it was to be forcibly sold to Moslems.

This order was carried out to the letter in the following winter. Under hard conditions of winter travel 400 children died on the roads of Asia Minor. But the war that in anticipation brought suffering to the papal Armenians, gave them in the event deliverance. Among the preliminary articles of peace concluding the Russo-Turkish War of 1828-29 was one relative to religious freedom, forbidding all forcible conversions to Islam, securing to non-Moslems the liberty to follow any faith of their choice, and granting to the papists the free exercise of their faith. Under this last clause, by an edict of Sultan Mahmud, the papal Armenians were restored to their homes and properties (1830). In the following year (1831) the independent Papal Community of Turkey was recognized. In this year ground was broken for the first church edifice of the Armenian papists at Constantinople, St Savior's of Galata, to which Bezjian himself generously contributed.

Anthony Nurijan became the first papal Primate of Constantinople, being consecrated Archbishop of the Papal Armenians July 23, 1830. By a Papal Bull of July 30, Pope Pius VIII placed under the jurisdiction of the Primate of Constantinople, the capital, with the territory to the eastward through Asia Minor to Armenia, but not including Cilicia, Cappadocia, Syria or Mesopotamia, which at that time were under the papal Catholicate of the Lebanon at Bzommar (founded 1740). Nurijan, however, being an Austrian subject, was left in charge of spiritualities only, while to the civil headship of the community was elected the Vartabed Jacob Manuelian, confirmed in office by the Porte June 5, 1831.

Subsequent History

By the election, in 1866, of Anthony Hasunian, Archbishop of Constantinople, to the Catholicate of the Lebanon, the two primacies were consolidated. The Papal Bull of 1867 issued upon the occasion of Hasunian's consecration at Rome as Patriarch of

Constantinople, embraced the following provisions, viz.: The Patriarchate of Cilicia (Catholicate of the Lebanon) and the Presidency of Constantinople are consolidated into the Patriarchate of Constantinople; the ancient Armenian Liturgy is approved for use in the Uniat churches; Patriarchal and local synods are prohibited as being contrary to Papal and Episcopal rights and prerogatives; in the event that the Patriarchal chair becomes vacant, Bishops alone shall vote for a new Patriarch or Vicar; a Patriarch-elect shall not serve until his election shall have been ratified by the Pope; until a Patriarch has received his pallium from Rome, he may not consecrate bishops, convene councils, bless the chrism, dedicate churches, or ordain priests; every five years the Patriarch shall report in person to the Pope; no Patriarch shall have a right to alienate church property without the Pope's consent; an episcopal see becoming vacant, the Patriarch shall call a council of his Bishops and have selected three nominees from whose number the Pope may designate a successor.

No sooner had Hasunian assumed his post than violent controversies began to break out (1870). Shortly after the adjournment of the Vatican Council, and in conformity with its previous pronouncements, the Pope's Legate at Constantinople asserted by a judgment dated November 2, 1870, the "full, sovereign, regular and immediate authority" of the Supreme Pontiff, "in matters pertaining to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world, that is, not alone the government and discipline of the Church at large, or as a whole, but also the discipline and government of all particular churches as such." Now this was placing a yoke of servitude upon the necks of Armenians ill-accustomed as a people from the remotest times to bear it. The people resented the autocratic pretensions of the Pope, who in his turn suspended the recalcitrants. This was followed up by the Pope's Legate excommunicating four Bishops and forty-five priests, secular and monastic, together with their constituency. The popular party, as they might be called, elected one Kupelian, a common priest, whom they ordained a Bishop, and set up as opposition Patriarch with the full connivance of the Porte, thus driving Hasunian out of the country (1872). In the end the Papacy, as might have been expected, prevailed, but a considerable

number of the Papal clergy, among them being Ormanian, afterward Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople (1896-1908), forsook the Church of Rome and returned to the communion of their fathers (1879). Since then the question of the continued use of the ancient Armenian Liturgy as against the innovation of the Latin Mass has been a perennial source of internecine strife.

Like Armenian Protestantism after it, Armenian Romanism has remained an exotic of arrested growth. At the beginning of the present century, on the eve of the First World War, its adherents numbered fewer than 140,000, or about four per cent of the Armenian people.

CHAPTER XXI

THE EVANGELICAL MOVEMENT

UNTIL the recognition of a Roman Catholic community in the Turkish Empire there were but two families of Christian denominations with a legal standing in the country, roughly corresponding with the Greek Orthodox and the Eastern Dissenting Churches, of which latter the Armenian had the most considerable following. With the recognition in 1831 of the Catholic Community, Western Christianity gained an equal status with the others. The next logical step appeared to be the legal recognition of Western Dissent, and by a strange coincidence in the very year that the Catholics received their Charter, the first Protestant missionary also appeared at the Turkish capital. In that same year the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions directed one of its missionaries, William Goodell, who had a few years' experience at Beirut, and during a Druze uprising in the Lebanon had fled to Malta, to proceed to Constantinople to begin Armenian work there. Meantime (1830-31) Eli Smith and Henry Dwight had set forth on their memorable journey through Armenia, at the close of which the latter received instructions to join Goodell at Constantinople (1832).

The Evangelical Union

At this time there was another appreciable religious awakening among the Armenians of the Turkish capital, the Academy at their Patriarchate, reopened in 1829, being the main agency in the promotion of it. The distinguished principal of this school, Peshtimaljian, was a layman of wide learning, author of several important educational works, and entertained enlightened views. The missionaries found among his students some of their warmest friends, notably John Der-Sahakian, their first convert, who being afterward (1843-48) educated in the United States, served as pastor of Protestant churches at Adabazar, Hasskeuy, Bardezag and Nicomedia, until his death in 1865.

Sahakian in 1834 was appointed superintendent of a short-lived mission high school in the Pera quarter of the city. With him

as secretary, in 1836, the Evangelical Union was organized, a secret society, in everything but name a church, which soon carried on a voluminous correspondence with the provinces. The organization of this society may properly be said to mark the beginning of Armenian Protestantism. The society's activities did not long continue uninterrupted. A persecution followed in 1839, when Sahakian himself was exiled to a convent at Cesarea in Asia Minor. The diplomatic situation just then afforded no impediment to the persecutors. To the last man the corps of foreign diplomats were either indifferent to American missionaries or openly hostile to them, while the American Chargé d'Affaires, Commodore Porter, entertained views of the Turkish-American Treaty of Commerce (1830) that completely ruled out all missionary enterprises.

This persecution, however, soon came to an abrupt end. Sultan Mahmud, by whose sanction the persecutors had done their work, died, and the Invasion of Asia Minor by Ibrahim Pasha of Egypt afforded the Turks a diversion. A period of increased missionary activity then ensued, marked by open controversy through lecture room and press. A Mission High School was opened at Bebek, on the Bosphorus, in 1840, with Cyrus Hamlin in charge. Two years later the position of the missionaries was further strengthened by a note from Daniel Webster, then Secretary of State, to Commodore Porter at Constantinople, instructing him to protect the missionaries as he would any other citizens of the United States.

Excommunication and Organization

But it was not long before a second and more violent persecution followed. Of this the first victim was Vertanes Esnak Gregorian, a priest of Nicomedia (Ismid), who since 1840 had been residing at or near the capital, and once previously had attracted the hostile eye of the ecclesiastical authorities. On January 25, 1846, a Sunday, at the close of the morning's service, and before the mass, the patriarchal church was darkened, the great screen drawn before the altar, and a solemn bull of excision and anathema launched by the Patriarch Matthew (1844-48) against all the "modern sectaries," and against Vertanes in particular, who was

styled "a devil and a child of the Devil," "a traitor and murderer of Christ," and "a house destroying and ravening wolf." All houses and shops of the "new sectaries" were placed equally under the ban, believers being forbidden to have any social or business dealings whatever with them.

In the course of the ensuing four weeks the evangelicals were called one by one to the Patriarchate and required under anathema to subscribe to nine test points of doctrine, as follows: (1) A correct creed, in order to salvation, must be supplemented by good works; (2) the Church never can err, and there is no truth set forth in the Bible that she has not always been aware of; (3) there are seven sacraments, including matrimony, which cannot be administered except by men in the apostolic succession; (4) baptism, confession and penance are saving ordinances, to be supplemented after death by the mass, alms and prayers of the Church; (5) the mass is the true body and blood of Christ, and one must needs partake of it in that belief to be saved; (6) the Virgin Mary and the saints are to be revered, along with all relics and consecrated crosses and pictures; (7) the creed and traditions, rites and ceremonies of the Universal Church are true and acceptable; (8) there must needs be gradations in the clergy; neither does an unworthy cleric bring any disgrace upon the creed or status of the Church herself; (9) all rights of private interpretation of scripture must be renounced.

From several of the foregoing points, especially 2 and 3, it is evident that the Patriarch Matthew was strongly tinged with Romanism.

Some thirty evangelicals during the time indicated, refusing to subscribe their names to the foregoing points, were excommunicated by name and delivered up to Satan. Thereby approximately seventy individuals of the capital were driven from their homes, and about one-half that number lost their trade licenses. Acute destitution followed, relieved only by the charities of sympathizers in Europe and America. Social and business ostracism continued for many years after the official ecclesiastical ban had been removed, and prevailed even longer in the provincial towns than at the capital.

Matthew, on June 21, 1846, published a bull of perpetual ex-

communication and anathema, forever barring all Protestants from membership in Holy Church. This served as the occasion for organizing Protestant churches. Accordingly on July 1, 1846, the First Church of Constantinople was formed at Pera. The Protestants also had their nine counter points which at this time were submitted to candidates for membership, viz.: (1) The Triune God alone is to be worshipped; (2) the religious use of relics, crosses and pictures, and prayers for the dead, are contrary to Scripture; (3) man is naturally depraved and needs the regenerating power of God, and the preaching of the Word is the chief medium of conversion; (4) the Holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith and practice; (5) Christ is the sole Head of the Church, Savior and Intercessor, and the one only Atonement for Sin; (6) salvation is by faith alone, and not by meritorious works of prayer, fasting, almsgiving or penance; (7) a holy life is the true mark of a saved soul; (8) any organized group of true Christians is a Church of Jesus Christ, and (9) there are but two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Churches were organized in July and August of this year also at Nicomedia, Adabazar and Trebizond. The aggregate communicant membership of the four churches at the end of a year was about 140, and the entire Protestant community numbered a few over a thousand. An Imperial Iradé, secured by the great British Ambassador, Sir Stratford Canning, afterward Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, November 15, 1847, granted the Protestant community the right of freedom of conscience. By an Imperial Firman of November 27, 1850, the community's legal status as a "Nation" was permanently confirmed.

Progress

During the first ten years of the Evangelical Movement churches were organized as follows: In 1846, Constantinople First, Nicomedia, Adabazar and Trebizond; in 1847, Erzurum; in 1848, Aintab and Brusa; in 1850, Constantinople Second; in 1851, Diarbekir and Sivas; in 1852, Constantinople Third, Aleppo, Killis and Rodosto; in 1853, Smyrna, Kessab and Marsovan; in 1854, Cesarea, Arabgir, Akhissar, Tocat and Marash; in 1855, Mashker (near Harput), Divrik and Adana. The growth of the

Aintab field (including Marash, Kessab, Killis, Urfa and Adana) was phenomenal. In this field the number of Protestants by 1850 equalled, perhaps exceeded, that of all the rest of the empire. The rate of planting churches in the ensuing twenty years was not so rapid: In 1856, Harput and Khnus; in 1861, Aidin; in 1863, Diarbekir; in 1864, Bitlis and Malatia; in 1870, Gurun; in 1871, Zeitun; in 1872, Hadjin, and in 1876, Van. Territorial organizations were effected as follows: In 1864, the Bithynia Union, and the Aintab Presbyterial Assembly; in 1865, the Harput Evangelical Union; in 1868, the Central Evangelical Union, and in 1872, the Cilicia Union.

Noteworthy revivals swept over the field from time to time. Under labors, among others, of a grandmother of the writer, there was a revival at Bardezag, in the Nicomedia district, in 1866, when that congregation quadrupled. In 1866-67 there were revivals at Marash and Harput. The latter congregation in the course of twenty years gave to the Church at large seven ministers of the gospel. At Bitlis there was an awakening in 1866, and again in 1870, and in 1876. In 1889 Aintab had a revival which spread to Marash, Hadjin, Adana and Cesarea. Still another revival swept in 1902-03 over the Central Turkey field, affecting Aintab, Marash, Hadjin, Adana, Tarsus, Killis, Aleppo and Urfa. Students and professors at Aintab College were active workers in this movement, "attended by such numbers of people that it attracted the attention of the government, and at the instigation of enemies an order was issued restricting the number of public meetings to three in each week." A considerable number of Jews are said at this time to have asked for baptism.

Young Men's Christian Associations, and Young People's Societies of Christian Endeavor were organized at numerous points. The first Society of Christian Endeavor seems to have been formed in 1886 at Van. In 1891, there were Young Men's Christian Associations housed in special buildings at Adana, Aintab and Marash. Elsewhere the Christian Associations, like the Christian Endeavor Societies, were only local auxiliaries of the churches.

In 1914, or on the eve of the First World War, there were in Turkey 137 Protestant churches, with 179 pastors and preachers, 13,891 communicants, and 50,900 adherents. With this last figure

closely tallies that of Ormanian in his diocesan statistics for 1910, namely, 49,050, which he gives as the number of Protestants throughout the territorial bounds of the Armenian Church in Turkey.

Ministerial Personnel

The success of the evangelical work in Turkey was owing largely to its fine body of native pastors and preachers. We have space here to name but a few of the most representative among them. Gregory Harutunian, and Polat Avedis, pastors at Aintab from 1856 forward, "men who would be deemed remarkable anywhere." John "Concordance," blind evangelist (died 1869), celebrated for his readiness in quoting scripture by chapter and verse. A tract from his pen on tithing was translated into English and several other languages, and read the world over, the American Board alone circulating 90,000 copies. He was a native of the Arabgir district, a graduate of the Harput Seminary, and labored at Havadorig, a mountain village near Mush. Simon Davidian, born at Dalvorig, in the Armenian province of Sasun, labored at Khnus, Tchévirmé, Mush and Bitlis. "A man of originality of character, extraordinary learning and great practical ability." He died in 1894, aged 84 years, crushed by the news of the Sasun massacres, leaving behind him a fragrant name for sanctity and service. Thomas Boyajian, ordained in 1863 at Diarbekir, soliciting funds in the United States in 1867 for a church building. He served also as British Consul, and died in 1895. "Probably no Armenian in the interior of Turkey had a higher reputation than he. He was a man of noble character, a very eloquent preacher, and a successful diplomat withal." Avedis Eretzian, pastor at Yozgat, and later (1871-85) the gifted leader of the Society of Gregory the Illuminator, at Cesarea. With his wife and son, he lost his life in the massacre of 1895. Keropé Yaghoubian, ordained in 1865, and for many years pastor of the Cesarea Church, which from small beginnings he developed into a place of large usefulness. He died in the deportations of 1915. Garabed Gabrielian, the "Armenian Spurgeon," eloquent preacher, beloved pastor at Nicomedia, and, after 1875, at Scutari, Constantinople. Following a sojourn in the United States, where he had adopted Baptist

views, he returned in 1883 to the Turkish capital, where he preached for the last twenty years of his life. Harutun Jenanyan, educator, founder of academies at Tarsus and Iconium, and revivalist, in which last capacity he labored from 1889 onward at Aintab, Marash, Adana, Cesarea, Talas, Yozgat, Istanos and Sivas. He is said to have shown great skill in adapting modern revival methods to the conditions of Turkey. Hagopos (Jacobus) Jeizian, professor at Robert College, and preacher during a half century of the First Church of Constantinople, pride and ornament of the Protestant pulpit of the capital. Died 1924.

Equipment and Influence

One of the greatest handicaps of the churches was in their lack of proper housing, and the Turkish government always regarded Protestant building enterprises with jealousy. Almost the last church to own a fit place of worship in the land was the mother church at the capital where the government from the beginning was especially hostile. The site had been purchased in the year of organization (1846). Not until 1904 was a firman for the building issued. The edifice was dedicated in 1907. The church at Cesarea dedicated a house of worship in 1878, erected by government firman, with funds collected by the pastor in Scotland. It was said to be the first church building worthy the name erected by the Protestants of Turkey.

Ill equipped, the Protestant movement was not without its direct influence upon the old Church and community. In 1863 it could be said of the Armenians of Marash, "Drunkenness and superstition are diminishing; thousands have been led to see the emptiness of their dead forms of worship, who are not ready to espouse the cause of despised Protestantism." Another wrote in 1871: "There is a great work going on in Aintab among the Armenians, outside of the Protestant congregations. I was surprised to find so many Armenians who are evangelical in sentiment." In this latter year the Bishop of Amasia swept two churches of their silver and gold plate, and appropriated the proceeds from its sale for the building of school houses and the support of teachers.

Reform societies of old school Armenians were organized in

various places. In 1865 there was formed at Harput a society having for its avowed object the reforming of the Church and the maintenance of preaching. In 1868 there came into being at Cesarea a society whose members, bitterly opposed to Protestantism, were themselves Protestants in all but name, seeking to enlighten the Church from within. This society continued in existence until suppressed by the government in 1885. In 1883 there flourished at Marash a strong reform society which demanded the discarding of church pictures and the Liturgy in the ancient tongue, and advocated Bible preaching by the clergy.

Even revivals occurred here and there. In 1884 there was an old Church youths' revival at Sivas, with prayer-meetings morning and night, at which, we are told, so many were anxious to pray that their leader hardly could find time to speak. Most striking, if not most influential, was the movement of "Lovists," at Yarpuz and Zeitun, who held revival meetings marked by great fervor, proclaiming salvation through Christ alone. These Lovists, at the last-named place, had hundreds of enrolled members. Before long, however, they ran into erratic extremes, claiming the gift of prophecy and seeing visions. After running its course for about ten years, this movement finally was crushed out by the hierarchy (1890).

Impediments

For all that, it cannot be said that the Armenian people as a whole took kindly to Protestantism. Why, one might ask, did not Protestantism among the Armenians of the nineteenth century make the same sort of headway as we witness among the Germans of the sixteenth? Many minor reasons might be named, but we deem the following specially important. In general the Armenians of the nineteenth century were not mentally so enlightened as were the German people of the sixteenth, nor, partly owing to a natural desire of the mission to keep down expenses, did the Armenian Reformation largely develop that type of native leadership essential to the success of great movements. The Armenians also, unlike the Germans, were a subject people, scattered among alien races, and living under the watchful eye of a jealous and hostile government that marked their every movement and inter-

ferred constantly with their right of assembly. And, last of all, the grievances of the German people of the sixteenth century against a foreign Pope were numerous and real, and their revolt therefore patriotic as well as religious, whereas the Armenian Reformation was entirely spiritual in its character, and of foreign importation, thus surrendering all apparent considerations of patriotic pride to the opposite side, so that the masses, never awake to the more refined demands of patriotism, viewed the disruption of the Church against which they had no personal grievance as the one thing at all costs to be avoided. For reasons such as these the Armenians who long had refused to be absorbed into the Greek or the Latin Church, refused now to turn Protestants.

The American Missions

The expansion of Protestantism among the Armenians can not be fully estimated without a view of the parallel growth of the American Missionary Enterprise in Turkey. In 1850 the American Board had seven stations (Constantinople, Bebek, Brusa, Smyrna, Trebizond, Erzurum and Aintab), with eighteen missionaries, six native pastors and preachers, and eight churches with a total communicant membership of about 240. By 1860 the field had been subdivided into three Missions, the Western, the Central and the Eastern. In this latter year there were 23 stations, over 100 missionaries, male and female, 40 pastors and preachers, and the same number of evangelical churches with a total communicant membership of approximately 1,300 souls. By the year 1890 the Board's Turkish Missions had become a one-third interest, having one-third of its converts throughout the world, employing one-third of its force and its funds, and contributing one-third of all native gifts. This position they maintained to the end. In 1914 the Board had fifteen stations, and 146 missionaries.

During the period from 1819 to 1896, or from the beginning until the time of the first great Armenian massacres, the Board expended on its Turkish Missions, including Syrian and Greek work, approximately \$7,000,000, and employed 700 missionaries. In 1896 the valuation of the mission plant was \$1,500,000. At the outbreak of the First World War it was stated that the American Board's investments in Turkey during the 96 years of operation

aggregated \$20,000,000. Lands, buildings and equipment were valued at \$2,000,000, while the annual appropriations for operating expenses were \$360,000. The Turkish Missions Aid Society, organized in England in 1854, and renamed in 1893 the Bible Lands Missions Aid Society, an agency interdenominational in character, numbering among its patrons both churchmen and non-conformists, also rendered material aid, in the 50 years preceding 1905 contributing for *native work* in the Near East, over \$540,000, of which \$335,000 went for work in Asia Minor and European Turkey.

Each Mission of the three named had its own theological school for the training of a native ministry, the Western at Bebek (Constantinople), and later (1865) at Marsovan; the Central at Aintab, later (1865) at Marash, and the Eastern at Tocat, later (1859) at Harput. The Board's work in higher education in time proved itself of greater importance than had been fairly anticipated. The example set by Robert College, named for Christopher R. Robert, a New York merchant and original donor, founded by Cyrus Hamlin at Rumeli Hissar, on the Bosphorus (1871), was followed by the Board at other points. Colleges were opened as follows: Central Turkey College at Aintab, 1874; Euphrates College at Harput, 1876; Anatolia College at Marsovan, 1886; International College at Smyrna, 1902, and St Paul's Institute at Tarsus, 1904. Four of these Colleges, Euphrates, Central Turkey, Anatolia and St Paul's, had endowments aggregating, on the eve of the First World War, over \$300,000. Funds were being raised for a College at Van when the War broke out.

In female education the missionaries were pioneers. The first Armenian girls' boarding school was opened by a Miss Lovell at Pera in 1845. In 1868 the Ely sisters took charge of a girls' boarding school at Bitlis, founded two years previously. They conducted for many years, and well up to the eve of the Great War, the only boarding school for girls in that whole region. A similar school was opened in 1868 at Marsovan, followed in 1871 by a Home School at Scutari, Constantinople, whose first building was erected in 1875-76. In 1890 this school became the American College for Girls at Constantinople, removed in 1914 to the opposite shore of the Bosphorus and renamed Constantinople College. In

1874 a girls' school was opened in Nicomedia which later was removed to Bardezag, across the Bay, and in 1886 to Adabazar. The people of Marash in 1880 gave \$2,250 for a girls' seminary, which was opened in 1886 under the name of the Central Turkey College for Girls. In 1881 the Collegiate Institute for Girls was founded at Smyrna. The first kindergarten in the country was opened in 1884 as a department of this institution by a Miss Bartlett, daughter of a missionary.

Ancillary Agencies

The deepest and most enduring single evangelical influence upon the Armenians of Turkey at large came from the combined work of the American Board and the American Bible Society in disseminating the Scriptures in the people's vernacular, notably through Goodell's Bible for Turkish speaking Armenians published in 1842, and Elias Riggs' Modern Armenian Bible published in 1853. In the early 'seventies some 30,000 copies of the Bible were sold annually in the Empire. It was estimated that not far from 300,000 Bibles were in daily use. Three Bible women of Cesarea visiting 860 families of that city reported finding Bibles in 763 of them. In 1873 the American Bible Society dedicated in Constantinople a Bible House, which was used as headquarters for all Protestant missionary agencies at the capital, and served to lend Protestantism a prestige it had not previously enjoyed. By the 'eighties relations between the Old Church and the evangelical community were cordial enough to admit of collaboration on a Modern Armenian New Testament published under the Patriarch's Imprimatur to secure its free circulation among his people (1882).

At the first medical work was not so vigorously prosecuted as other departments of the Mission, partly for the reason that the empire on the whole was not so destitute as some other mission lands of medical service. In 1859 a Dr. West went out to Turkey, spending most of his missionary life at Sivas, where he also trained a number of young men for the medical profession. He died in 1876. In the year following Dr. Raynolds was at Van, and Dr. Parmelee at Erzurum, the two only medical missionaries of the Board then in Turkey. By 1906, however, there were good mission

hospitals at Aintab, Talas, Marsovan, Merdin and Van. The Hospital at Aintab in 1907 reported 58,543 treatments in one year, or an average of 194 for each working day. In 1910 a hospital was opened at Mezereh, in the Harput district. In 1914 there were ten mission hospitals, treating annually 180,000 patients.

What Remains

How much was left of Armenian Protestantism after the cataclysm of the First World War remains to show. At the beginning of that war, in 1914, there were in the three Missions of the American Board in Turkey some 150 missionaries, 1,200 native workers, and 137 organized churches with annual contributions for religious and educational purposes reaching a total of \$200,000. In 1918, or immediately after the war in Europe, there were but 36 missionaries in the field, while in the whole extent of Asia Minor not more than 200 out of the original total of 1,200 native workers were found alive. Churches, schools and hospitals, with the sole exception of those at Constantinople and Smyrna, were closed or wiped out of existence. It should be borne in mind that this was before the Greco-Turkish War following the world conflict, and before the "exchange of populations."

A later investigation, in 1925, revealed not more than 15 organized Armenian Protestant churches throughout Turkey and Greece, and fewer than two dozen in Syria. In the two lands first named there were 1,498 communicants, with a total constituency of 12,101, these figures, however, embracing Greek evangelical churches as well as the Armenian. In Syria there were 1,502 communicants, and a constituency of 11,980. This makes a grand total of 3,000 communicants as against 13,000, and 24,081 adherents as against an approximate 50,000, before the War. The native contributions in Turkey and Greece in 1925 totaled \$103,208, of which \$95,668 was for education, while in Syria the refugee churches contributed a total of \$14,776, of which \$8,126 was for education. In this same year there were four or five evangelical churches in the Caucasus, growing by constant accessions of straggling refugees.

Ten years later the geographical distribution of the refugee churches throughout the world was as follows. Most of the

Cilician Armenians having fled in 1921-23 to adjoining territory in Syria, the old Cilicia Union was there reorganized as the Armenian Evangelical Union of Syria and the Lebanon. The Union had twenty-two member churches, with a communicant membership of about 2,500. A School of Theology has been conducted for the training of ministers at Beirut since 1932 jointly by the American Board and the Presbyterian Board. There were refugee churches also at Jaffa and Jerusalem, in Palestine, and strong churches at Cairo and Alexandria, Egypt. There were four organized churches in Athens and the Piraeus, and one at Salonika, the last with a building of its own, and there were three or four churches in Bulgaria, notably at Sofia and at Varna. Three unorganized congregations of not more than thirty members each were all that remained in Asiatic Turkey, one at Adana, a second at Cesarea, and a third at Marsovan. There were also three churches at Constantinople, with three preaching stations in the suburbs. The evangelicals were active in Soviet Armenia, where two former Harput ministers among others were laboring, and there were Protestant Armenian groups and workers in France, at Paris, Lyons and Marseilles, in which last-named city a religious paper was also published. In Latin America, refugee churches were found at Mexico City, Buenos Aires, Montevideo and Sao Paulo. Some of these congregations, notably those in Syria, have been aided by the Council of Armenian Missions, composed of representatives of the American Board and the Armenian Missionary Association of America.

CHAPTER XXII

ITS SIGNIFICANCE

WE MUST now look into the meaning of the Protestant movement to the various groups to which it stood related. And first to the evangelicals themselves.

To the Evangelicals Themselves

Armenian Protestantism had its own ethical standards. Everywhere it stood more or less strictly for abstinence from intoxicating drinks. In this respect some evangelical communities were most rigid. At Marash in 1860 no wine could be found in any Protestant house even for sacramental purposes. In 1883 the Protestant village of Karakala, near Kars, adopted a constitution containing this clause: "The use in the village of intoxicating liquor except as a medicine is strictly prohibited." Protestants everywhere acquired also a name for truthfulness and reliability. Said a prominent representative in central Turkey of a foreign government, himself a Roman Catholic, "I have been greatly impressed with these Protestants; they are another sort of people."

Among all Protestants the Sabbath came to its own as a holy day. So early as 1862 a creditable fight was put up at Aidin, near Smyrna, when as yet the Protestants of the district were the merest handful, to prevent Moslem desecration of the Christian Sabbath. At the other end of Asia Minor, in 1880, in the wild mountain town of Zeitun, where formerly Sunday had been no different from other days, a stricter Sunday observance was enforced, every shop and store in the town being closed, and labor generally suspended.

Men's cash contributions are usually a good index of the value they put on their religion. It is a common charge against Armenian Protestantism that "American money brought it into being." The assertion is as true as that Papal money brought Armenian Romanism into being, or that the wealth of a few magnates sustained the National Church. But if it be meant that American money alone made Armenian Protestantism, no statement could be falser. For native money matched dollar for dollar,

Armenian Protestants always paying for their religion all they were able and a good deal more. The charge becomes still more meaningless when it is considered that American money in large part went to pay American missionaries and to support schools.

The liberality of the churches was constant in the face of adverse conditions. The missionary Greene, in 1869 on furlough in the United States, published a comparative table of gifts of the Armenian evangelical churches, and the churches of equal number of a single denomination in a Western State, which was not flattering to the American churches. In 1880 at Aintab there were four old-school Armenians to one Protestant; as to property per man, the two communions averaged about the same. Yet in that year the Protestants gave for preaching, education, poor relief and other purely benevolent objects more than twice as much as the old-school Armenians, or eight times as much per capita. "Never before," writes a missionary, "have I seen a more utterly disheartening state of things, physical, political, economic, yet have I never seen among the different communities such earnestness, such painful self-denial, which in many cases amounts to pure heroism, as during the past year. These people amaze me!" In 1893 Harput contributed for congregational and missionary purposes the sum of \$7,709. An additional \$4,523 for education brought up the total to \$12,232, contributed "in a famine year, 'in His name.'" The native gifts for all purposes within the bounds of the Western Turkey Mission in 1902-03 were \$66,652, of which amount \$48,806 was for education. In the same year in Central Turkey native contributions totaled \$17,657, "more than half of it for education." Tithing was not uncommon among the churches, notably at Harput, Marash and Marsovan.

Out of their poverty the evangelical churches contributed generously to the work of sending the gospel to less favored communities of the land. The region about Farkin, the ancient Martyropolis, beyond Diarbekir, was inhabited by a population of Kurdish-speaking Armenians. The district, comprising a hundred small towns, was in utter spiritual destitution. There was no resident priest there, but one visited the region once a year to baptize the children and to bless the graves of the dead. A Mission to Kurdistan was organized at Harput, and afterward

adopted by the entire Church. Seven young men educated at Marash at the Church's expense in 1868 were sent out to bring the gospel to this community. The best known missionary in this field, Kavmé Ablahatian, of Syrian extraction, toiled at Redvan 1876-88. By the year 1904 the work was entirely independent of American aid. In this year also the whole of the New Testament in Kurdish was ready for the press.

Self-support ever was the goal set before the churches. And indeed the evangelical churches were never unmindful of their duty and privilege in this matter. The First and Second Churches of Constantinople in 1860 consolidated and assumed self-support. Adabazar followed suit in 1862, Harput in 1865, the Marash churches in 1874, Marsovan in 1879, Tarsus in 1893. Many smaller churches from time to time did the same thing. In 1870, in the destitute Chunkush region northwest of Diarbekir, there were not less than eight churches entirely self-supporting, and eight others nearly so. In the Central Turkey field the home missionary society planned to assume a growing measure of the burden of self-support until the churches, by 1920 as was expected, should be entirely independent of foreign aid.

Several adverse circumstances alone defeated the complete realization of "a self-supporting Church." Pestilence decimated the churches. In the summer of 1865 the cholera raged in Constantinople, carrying off with its 50,000 victims the civil head of the Protestant community. In the summer of 1875 there was an epidemic of cholera at Antioch, Damascus, and Aintab, in which last place alone 2,000 perished. Famines were not infrequent in the land. In Asia Minor, during a famine in 1874, not fewer than 150,000 are estimated to have died. In the year following the missionaries at Cesarea alone were feeding 100,000 persons, their home churches contributing heavily toward the \$125,000 expended, which means that considerable money that might have been spent for evangelism went to feeding the hungry, of whom ninety-five per cent were shiftless and impermeable Moslems. There was another famine in 1880 in the regions of Diarbekir, Harput, Erzurum and Van. In that year forty Kurds died in the Erzurum district to one Christian, and probably an equal proportion received relief. A third famine visited Asia Minor and

Armenia in 1887. Government oppression also crippled the churches. At Marash, for example, it took two months' labor each year to pay the government taxes alone, and the city's Protestant community, with a church property valued at not more than \$2,500, was levied upon besides for an annual \$800 community tax, and one wonders how the poor people were able to raise an additional \$500 for the gospel in their midst. At Harput the government exacted from ten to fifteen per cent on land alone. A missionary at Talas (Cesarea district), wrote in the war year of 1877, "The collectors take the last cow, sheep or goat, and even cooking utensils, and the last bed from the poor peasants, and there is no appeal." In 1880, when the revenue of Turkey was one-fifth that of the United States, the allowance of the Sultan and his entourage was \$5,720,000, or one hundred and fourteen times the salary of the American President. Massacres of the Christian population in war and peace also took their toll. The massacres of 1877, of 1895-96, and of 1909, drained the congregations of some of their best blood, until finally the butcheries and deportations of 1915 swept the Armenian race, and with it the evangelical churches, out of Asia Minor. Last of all, emigration. So early as the year 1867 the flow of emigration from the Bitlis region of Armenia to the United States was perceptible. By 1880 the general exodus, mostly to the United States, was in full swing. Large numbers of young men five years later were leaving the Harput region in search of work in America, and so late as the year 1907, some forty, many of them Protestants, on a single day left that city for the New World. "Much of the vigor and resources of our communities have been transferred to America by the constant stream of emigration; some of our churches have lost fully half their strength; some count their losses by scores, others by hundreds."

To the Mission

As between the American Mission and the native Protestant Church, it was not to be expected that they always would see eye to eye. Where points of view differ, controversies are bound to arise. The missionary was an agent of a Board some 7,000 miles away, and viewed the interests of his Board, and his own

responsibility to it, as paramount. The native pastor first and last thought of his own people, and regarded the Board and its missionaries as but a means to a larger end. The viewpoints, it will be perceived, were each the exact reverse of the other, and only men of tact, discernment and grace on either side could sense the underlying unity of aim.

Some of the more radical missionaries seemed to believe that the best way to avoid trouble was to show the churches their place beforehand, that place being conceived as one of subserviency to the Mission. When in 1864 the Aintab Evangelical Union was formed, an article was inserted into the constitution fixing the position of the native Church as one of necessary subordination. Whenever, it was stipulated, in the judgment of the missionaries it became necessary for them to act in matters relating to the formation of churches, and the licensure, ordination or installation of ministers, without calling a regular meeting of the native ecclesiastical body, they were to be regarded as having the right to do so. It was also provided that the Union was to have no control over the funds in the hands of the missionaries.

In a field like the Aintab district, this attitude of the Mission, if not justifiable, at least was feasible. The people there were simple folk, Turkish-speaking, lacking in that national pride characteristic of the Armenian-speaking majority to the north, looking up to the missionary and trusting him implicitly. In the north, on the other hand, while finances did play a part in the controversy, the real root of bitterness lay in a highly developed racial or national consciousness, and a commendable desire to assert the rights and to assume the responsibilities of a native Church, which, it was conceived, the missionaries at times inclined to hold too long under tutelage. Certainly Hamlin's view of the native ministry hardly justified that distrust of them which some missionaries seem to have entertained: "They are men of sterling qualities, laborious, faithful and devoted. They know their rights, privileges, and duties; and if sometimes a little too jealous and zealous in maintaining them, it could hardly have been otherwise."

It was but a symptom of that not unwholesome insubordination of the native Church to the Mission that certain young men

of ability, finding that they would not be allowed to work with the missionaries on equal terms, sought an education abroad and returned to their homeland as representatives of such groups as would send them back with the full status of missionaries. In the very nature of the case such an arrangement would have been but temporary, for certainly a pastorate permanently supported by foreign funds were an anomaly. But it was conceded that the standing of any missionary whatever, native-born or foreign, was not a permanent one. In these circumstances, Shishmanian returned home (1879) representing the Disciples of Christ, and Haiguni representing the Baptists (1881), of the United States; Dobrashian returned as a medical missionary under commission of the English Quakers (1882); Gabrielian labored for a time (beginning 1883) under auspices of the American Baptists, and Jenanyan (1888, forward) under independent American auspices. Defections of congregations had the same general underlying cause. The First Church of Constantinople would have gone over in 1864 to the English Episcopal Church had it but met with encouragement from the Church Missionary Society. A faction of the Diarbekir Church for a time (1873-75) actually turned Episcopalian.

In 1882 the American Board took notice of the controversy and appointed a deputation to study the problem on the ground. In the spring of the following year this deputation was at Constantinople. It consisted of two committees working independently of each other, the one representing the Board's temporary committee, the other the permanent Prudential Committee. At a conference of this deputation with the missionaries the following resolutions were adopted:

That we continue to recognize the Evangelical churches of Turkey as the chief agency for its evangelization, and ourselves as their helpers and co-workers in the Gospel, and especially that we accord to the preachers and the pastors of these churches all fraternal honor and affection.

That in all our work, evangelistic, educational, or literary, the same weight is to be given to native opinion as to missionary opinion, and that the work be prosecuted so as to secure,

as far as possible, the concurrence of churches or brethren directly concerned and competent to judge in the premises; and we recommend that, as soon as possible, the stations give to brethren whose relations to the work render it suitable an equal responsibility and voice with themselves, as is now done in some cases in school boards, in literary works, etc.

It was also resolved that in places where native contributions approximated one-half the expense of the work, the entire care of evangelism should be left to the churches.

In 1884 there were formed, pursuant to these principles, "conferences" composed of missionaries and representatives of the native churches, one in each mission station. The results thereby obtained were pronounced of the happiest. Chambers, a missionary at Erzurum, two years afterward declared, "Every year I am more and more convinced of the wisdom of this co-operative move and astonished that there should have been fears entertained of its success." The Board itself was highly gratified with what had been accomplished: "The conferences of the missionaries with representatives of the native churches have been most helpful to both parties, and have inspired a mutual respect and regard of greatest moment to the welfare of the common cause."

To the Mother Church

The true significance of the evangelical movement to the Armenian people lies not in its numerical strength, but in its moral influence. Like that of all important minorities its chief function is to hold up before the majority certain vital objectives in default of which that majority is all too prone to relapse into the old barren and self-complacent ways. Protestants, if for no other reason than sentiment, have had no design to break down the old Church, but to build it up. Of this no surer proof could have been given than the fact that, unlike Catholic institutions, Protestant orphanages always welcomed Armenian priests to give religious instruction to children of their own faith.

From the beginning Armenian Protestantism has stood for an intelligent faith. The early missionaries' claim that it saved the Armenians from French infidelity was not an idle one.⁴⁷ Orman-

ian quotes a writer of about 1750 to the effect that at that time "there began to spread abroad a certain heresy of infidelity," adding, "There is no further explanation, but perhaps the allusion is to Protestantism."⁴⁸ But at that time the Armenians were still too ignorant of Protestantism to have thought very much about it. So late as 1774, indeed, the Catholicos Simeon I uses the term "Lutheranism" as but an opprobrious epithet, of the Armenian Catholics!⁴⁹ No, rather, the allusion is to that form of unbelief emanating from France before the Revolution. And Protestantism did in a small measure for the Armenians what it did more largely for the British peoples. It saved them from the snare of an unbelieving rationalism.

So far, however, despite the fact that old controversies and misunderstandings have died down and cordial relations between Gregorians and Protestants now prevail, few of the effects of a counter reformation in the old Church as yet are discernible. The tendency of the masses is to cling to that which is hallowed by age, very much as royalty clings to the old coach and livery, resorting occasionally to Protestant churches for the luxury of an edifying sermon, but continuing to look to the old Church for the sacraments. Reforms do not come by fiat of the clergy; the people must demand them. And as the people so far have thought of reform in externals only and on the lowest terms, so have their clergy.

Since the rise of the Protestant Reformation, the Church has had at least two reforming Catholicos. Let us see how far along they got with their reforms.

George IV was a native of Constantinople, and reigned at Etchmiadzin in the twenty years from 1866 to 1885. In a pontifical Bull issued on his accession in 1867, he indicated the following objectives: (1) To perform no baptisms in private homes, neither to delay the rite more than eight days from birth; (2) aside from the Mass, to give to the people no communion during the Lenten season; (3) to marry none without the mutual consent of both parties; (4) to permit a fourth marriage only to young and healthy persons; (5) to discourage the sale of women in marriage under guise of a dower; (6) to employ the vernacular in the churches only in sermon and exhortation; (7) to enforce uniform-

ity in ritual and song; (8) to adhere to the very letter of the old doctrinal standards.

This Catholicos in 1872 forbade the induction into the priesthood of men without a sufficient education, and dedicated two years later at Etchmiadzin a Seminary having an endowment of 335,000 rubles (about \$167,500). The Church tunes in this reign were reduced to writing, the Hymnary, the Liturgy and the Hoursbook being annotated, and priests were instructed in notation. Some of this may be progress, but it is not what Protestants mean by Reformation.

Khrimian, the other of the two, became Catholicos as Megrditch I in 1892, and reigned until 1908. He put his finger on one of the sore spots of the Church when he said ironically, "What have you given us (the clergy) that you expect a return? What culture and what training have we known, that we might manifest the abilities you require of us?" The laity of the Church surely have never come to a full realization of their responsibility here. If they had, they would have lavished less money on decadent monasteries, and built more colleges! Of the man himself, Khrimian's counsel to Isaac II, Catholicos of Sis, in 1907, was a true index: "Pursue no vainglorious or non-essential ends; regard with a lofty contempt all merely external form; wage war against hurtful obstructions alone; labor for the mental improvement of Armenian youth; elevate the fallen moral level of the people of the provinces, and enlighten their minds to live together in brotherly harmony." It was the sincerity and devotion of the man animating those words that forever endeared him to the people.

What was Khrimian able to accomplish in the way of Church Reform? In 1906 he consulted the Catholicos of Sis, and the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople, on the remarriage of parish priests, received negative opinions from all of them, and dropped the matter. Two priests of the diocese of Bitlis having blessed each the other's second nuptials were unfrocked. Divorce was placed on a more latitudinarian basis, though no divorce laws were enacted. The degrees of consanguinity were reduced in number from seven to six. In the same year also Khrimian called a Constitutional Assembly, to draw up for Russian Armenia and other Russian dioceses a Constitution similar to the one in

force in Turkey. The Assembly, however, having met, the Dashnakist revolutionaries gained control of it, and the provincial police promptly dissolved it. Khrimian died the following year.

That were small result for a man of such high aims as Khrimian. The truth is that the leaders of the Church fail still to grasp the things that make for spiritual reformation. Not by the introduction of a few superficialities, the modification of a few rules, the modernizing of worship, the introduction of new church furniture and pews, is a Church's true reformation accomplished, but by the discovery, perhaps the rediscovery, of truth, by such a new emphasis on doctrine and principle of conduct as makes the past live in a new and a higher church life. The Armenian Church has stood in the past for some great ideas. It were not sufficient to say, like George IV, We will keep them unaltered, and to lay them away wrapped up in a napkin. If lay representation, a national consciousness, a Divine Christ, and salvation by faith in Him, have entered into the Church's past experience, why not now bring them forward again, and make them the armor, not the winding sheet, of the Church, that she may be enabled to go forth into the world with a message that gives life?

A more hopeful movement from the ranks seemed to be initiated in the later 'sixties, when a Doctor of the Church, Jacob Chilingirian, once a monk of the Armenian Monastery of Jerusalem, published (1868) a plan of reform going back, as he conceived, to first principles as enunciated by Gregory the Illuminator. The movement thus initiated made special headway in Cesarea, as we have seen, a former Protestant minister assuming the leadership of it.⁵⁰ But the old Church did not accept it. Chilingirian's proposed reform movement was pronounced Anglicanism. And that was that! The real rub was in determining whether the Illuminator's Christianity was sufficiently primitive and sufficiently Apostolic. That recalls monasticism, itself constituting a problem. Having filled an important place in another age, the monasteries today are utterly inadequate to meet the demands of a modern ministry. Yet the Church's higher clergy are all monastery bred. And they rule the Church and determine its policies.

In the circumstances what hope is there for modernizing the Church?

The case is not hopeless. The Church may flee the world, but it cannot forever avoid the new mind. So far as external means are concerned, for an inward upbuilding, it probably will adopt sooner or later the following or similar measures. First, an educated and adequately supported clergy, competent to instruct and lead the people, without the inclination or the temptation, for a living, to encourage popular superstition. Second, a national ecumenical Assembly, composed of clergy and laity, such as now meets only to elect a new Catholicos, to deliberate periodically on the activities and needs of the Church, and report upon its proceedings to the people. Third, an educational program for the instruction of the Church's youth, of which a promising beginning already has been made in some places, notably in Syria, under auspices of the Bible Lands Union, and a missionary program devised to help the Church shoulder again its share of the task of world-evangelization. And finally, a closer contact with ecumenical Christendom such as, while conserving the Church's time-honored independence, will put it in actual touch with world currents, and restore to it its pristine position as both debtor and contributor to our common faith and life.

To the Turkish Government

From the beginning the antagonism of the Turkish government to the American Mission never was in doubt. The missionaries' avowed purpose to use work among the native Christians of Turkey for a stepping-stone to Moslem work necessarily also would exasperate the Turks, and contribute to their resolve to eliminate both missionaries and native Christians when the time should be opportune.

For a time Moslem work actually was attempted. A number of Turks after the Crimean War, encouraged by what seemed to be the dawn of a new era of religious toleration, embraced Christianity. About 1857, at Cesarea, a Turk by the name of Ahmed was converted, with his wife and three little daughters. Six Moslem converts were baptized in 1860 at the capital, one of them an aged imam, and by the end of the following year the

whole number of Turks baptized at Constantinople had reached twenty-three. Somewhat less than half a hundred Turks altogether were converted. The Jesuits baptized approximately the same number. By 1864, however, the Turkish government was employing restraining measures, and that, too, with the knowledge and sanction of the British Ambassador, Sir Henry Bulwer. Ten years later the Grand Vizier definitively declared that the Hatti Humayun provision for religious toleration did not contemplate Moslems.

Moslem work thereafter was confined to the publication of the Scriptures. In the five years preceding 1878, when a complete Turkish Bible was published, some 17,000 copies and parts of the New Testament were sold from the Constantinople Bible House, "mainly to Moslems." The missionary Parsons, of Bardezag, for his share in this work paid with his life in 1880. With his Armenian servant he was murdered in the open field in his sleep by agents of an imam to whom he had offered a Bible for sale. The assassins were arrested, identified, tried, convicted, imprisoned for a short time, and again set free by Hamid's government.

Among the forms which the government's hostility assumed were the suppression or suspension of newspapers, the closing of schools, the refusal of permits to erect school houses or places of worship, and the preventing of land passing into mission hands. "The government," said a committee chairman at the 1887 annual meeting of the Board who once had served as American Consul in Turkey, "feels its power gradually declining, and its empire crumbling away, and just in that proportion has it determined to resist more persistently every kind of interference from the civilized world."

In 1893 the mission girls' school at Marsovan was burned down by incendiaries. Professors Thoumaian and Kayayan, of the College, were arrested, tried and sentenced to death for alleged revolutionary activities, but later "pardoned," and expelled from the country. In 1895 mission property at Harput was burned, with an estimated loss of \$88,000. In the same year soldiers burned down the Mission Theological Seminary at Marash, the personnel of the mission being at the same time attacked. Meantime missionaries' touring rights were challenged. Frederick Greene, mis-

sionary at Van, in 1894 was expelled from the country. Two years later the younger Knapp, missionary at Bitlis, was arrested, taken under guard to Alexandretta, and shipped to Constantinople with a passport stamped "Expelled." The missionary, it was affirmed, had "indulged in all sorts of subversive intrigues." His real misdemeanor consisted in having aided in relief distribution among the doomed Armenians of Sasun, and in having been a foreign witness of Turkish barbarities whose testimony in future before investigating commissions might prove embarrassing to the Turkish government.

In the face of these hostile acts the American Congress early in 1895 made an appropriation of funds for the stationing of Consuls at Erzurum and Harput. In 1901 the Turks were forced to pay indemnities at Washington for losses sustained by the Mission. In the same year the French seized the Turkish port of Mitylene to enforce demands of their own, and President Roosevelt in 1904 dispatched to Turkish waters a fleet to reinforce demands under "the most favored nations clause," and based upon concessions to the French government. Matters were finally adjusted in 1907, when the Sultan issued an *Irade* recognizing all American institutions and residences in Turkey as lawfully established, and permitting the corporate ownership of mission property.

The Young Turks, taking the alarm from the rapprochement in this year between England and Russia, by a coup d'état, July 24, 1908, forced Abdul Hamid to restore the old Constitution of 1876, thus raising extravagant expectations of better days among both natives and foreigners. A sanguine missionary at Cesarea exclaimed, "This is nothing other than the birth of a genuine Ottoman nation. The Turks may surpass the Armenians in their appreciation of and devotion to the principles of real liberty and genuine civilization." More discerning minds abroad, however, perceived that the Young Turks were rabid chauvinists in whose vocabulary "union" and "progress" meant but the casting of all Ottoman nationalities into the Turkish mould. Following a parlor lecture delivered in London by Ahmed Riza Bey, afterward President of the Turkish Chamber, in 1904, one of those present said, "I am not sorry that the gentleman has spoken, because it

shows us how impossible it is to expect any reforms in Turkey from the Young Turkish party. They are only thinking of themselves. The liberties of the Christians would be just as unsafe under a Sultan with the sentiments of the gentleman who has just sat down, as under the present Sultan."⁵¹

How genuine was the conversion of Turkey at the "revolution" became shortly apparent when in the province of Adana, Cilicia, in April, 1909, 30,000 Armenians were done to death, among them being 16 Gregorian priests, and 19 Protestant ministers. The towns destroyed numbered 37, with 50 churches and schools, and over 5,000 houses and shops. "The large, prosperous church of Adana (Protestant) was reduced to dependence, losing 120 of its congregation, its church, school and parsonage, and sustaining private losses to the amount of nearly \$400,000." The Young Turks laid the blame for the Adana horrors on the Sultan whom they had deposed; but a second massacre perpetrated by troops they brought over from Macedonia "to restore order" belied their pretences. The province of Adana had enjoyed immunity during the massacres of 1895-96, and the Young Turks now saw to it that it was given a taste of blood.

The massacres and deportations of Armenians at the beginning of the First World War (1915) will receive their share of notice in the ensuing chapter. We pause here only to say that the atrocities accompanying that great conflict reduced the Armenian population of Turkey, approximating 1,850,000, by over two-thirds, and drove the survivors out to lands adjoining and beyond the seas. In one way and another the Great Powers of Europe on either side of the conflict helped in the elimination of Asia Minor's Christian population. In the First World War Europe sowed the wind, to reap the whirlwind in a Second World War. The American Board liquidated its hundred years' interests in Turkey, and withdrew from the field.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE GREAT TRIBULATION

IN THE nineteenth century Russia comes to the fore in the role of defender of the Christians of the Turkish empire. The Russo-Turkish War of 1828-29 emancipated two several fragments of that population, namely, 400,000 Greeks who were set up in an independent state, and 96,000 Armenians who were permitted to migrate from the Turkish districts of Erzurum, Kars and Bayezid into contiguous Russian territory. Again the Crimean War (1853-56) sprang from Russia's interference in Turkey in the interests of the Greek Christians, as checkmated by England and France.

In the interim of those two wars Turkey sought redemption through repentance. Two imperial rescripts of the Sultan Abdul Medjid were promulgated marking the beginning of what purported to be a policy of internal reform, namely, the Hatti Sherif of Gulhané, of November 3, 1839, promising certain tax reforms and an equal status for Christians and Moslems, and the Hatti Humayun, of June 6, 1853, further confirming the civic rights and privileges of the empire's Christians. Those two documents were the fountainhead of all the constitutional concessions that followed, devised in reality to temporize and to save Turkey's sovereign rights. Meantime the Turks aimed to reduce the causes for Russian interference by a decimation of their Christian minorities, whom they could not hope to assimilate and had no intention to emancipate.

Turkish massacres are as old as Turkish misrule, and by no means began with the late "Armenian atrocities." But here we are concerned with the Armenian phase of the Turkish tyranny. The Mush district of Armenia, no longer the flourishing province of St. Gregory's time,⁵² now was "one of the darkest and most oppressed regions in all Turkey." The population was largely Armenian, ground with the dust by Kurdish feudal lords enjoying the Turkish government's protection. The tax collector was lawless and cruel. Arson, plunder and rape were daily occurrences. Between 1860 and 1880 thousands of Armenian families, by

means secret and open, fled from the regions of Mush and Van into Russian territory. But that only increased the oppression of those left behind. "But oh," wrote in 1878 the elder Knapp, "the miserable condition of the Armenians! It is utterly impossible to give you the faintest idea of the facts."

Such conditions, prevailing only in a lesser degree in European Turkey, led to a revolt first in Herzegovina, then in Bulgaria, serving as the occasion for wholesale massacres (1875-76). With the object of forestalling Russian intervention, Count Andrassy, then Premier of Austro-Hungary, representing officially Russia and Germany as well as his own government, had already addressed to the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador in London a Note proposing certain reforms in European Turkey (December 30, 1875). This now was followed by a joint Note of similar tenor from Berlin to the Porte itself (May 13, 1876). The international situation was tense, and on May 18 Midhat Pasha, late Governor of the Province of the Danube and a Young Turk, was appointed minister at Constantinople without portfolio, charged with the special task of navigating the Turkish ship of state safely between the Scylla of foreign resentment, and the Charybdis of native bigotry.

One of Midhat's first acts in his new office was to depose Abdul Aziz, and to elevate to the throne Murad, who in turn was also deposed, to make way September 1 for Abdul Hamid II. By an armistice signed October 31, a war with Serbia and Montenegro threatening graver international complications was discreetly terminated. Midhat then freeheartedly declared to the three Powers that he by no means meant to reject the Berlin Note, but proposed to go even further, having himself for some time been busy preparing a Constitution intended to accomplish exactly what the Berlin Note contemplated, and not for a section of the Empire only, but for the whole of it! However, it was observed that two weeks after the publication in outline of this Constitution massacres began in Midhat's own late province. That in fact was a method of reform to be frequently applied in after years to the Armenians, under Young Turkish not less than under Hamidian regimes.

England Takes a Hand

At the instance of England a Conference now met at Constantinople, of the envoys and plenipotentiaries of Austro-Hungary, France, Germany, Russia, England and Turkey, to discuss conditions in the Christian provinces of the Turkish empire (December 11, 1876). No sooner, however, had this conference opened, than a salute of one hundred and one guns proclaimed to the world the birth of a Turkish Constitution (December 23). The Conference broke up, having accomplished nothing (January 20, 1877). Too many cooks had spoiled the broth.

Hamid, who was determined to rule as well as reign, now dismissed Midhat, his Grand Vizier (February 5), and banished him to Europe. Eventually (1883) Midhat was strangled in exile in Arabia. To cover up his own reactionary designs, however, the new Sultan called his first Parliament under the Constitution (March 4, 1877). Meantime rifles and ammunition kept coming from America, and breech-loading cannon from the Krupp works of Prussia. On April 24 Russia declared war, simultaneously invading Rumania and Armenia. The Russian armies in Europe advanced to the gates of Constantinople. By the Treaty of San Stefano, March 3, 1878, Bulgaria was set up as an independent state, and for all reforms in his Armenian provinces the Turk was made responsible directly to Russia alone.

But a British fleet already had been admitted through the Dardanelles (February 13, 1878). England now intervened. The Treaty of San Stefano was replaced by the Treaty of Berlin (July 13), making Turkey responsible not to Russia, but to all the Great Powers collectively. It developed at the Berlin Congress that previously (June 4) Turkey had given to England her pledge of good government in Armenia, surrendering the Island of Cyprus for a defense base against Russian aggression.

But England's Turkish policy was ever vacillating and weak. Lord Beaconsfield and the Marquis of Salisbury returned home from Berlin assuring their countrymen that they had secured "peace with honor." Salisbury lived to confess that England had put her money on the wrong horse. It was hard to play a humanitarian and an imperialistic game at one and the same time, two

horses that did not often race in the same direction. It was not four years after the Turkish Parliament was prorogued and the constitution abolished (1878), before England withdrew her consuls from the territory she had undertaken under the Cyprus Convention to supervise, leaving it simply to the honest intentions of the Turk not to misgovern it (1882). Sir William Ramsay has called the act "a crime of the deepest dye." To watch over the Christians of Armenia thereafter was to be neither Russia's nor England's concern.

With the object of forcing the hand of the Powers, a revolutionary society was formed at Erzurum (1882). Trouble in the Armenian provinces soon became acute (1883). In the Mush district Mousa Bey and his Kurds inaugurated a reign of terror. This robber baron in 1886 was Mudir of his district, armed with full power from the central government. In 1889 his depredations were at their height. Mousa Bey and his Kurdish chiefs were summoned to the capital, feasted and decorated by Abdul Hamid, and sent back to Armenia decked out with uniforms and banners to organize the Hamidieh cavalry, named for the Sultan himself, ostensibly as a gesture against Russia, in reality to prey upon the Armenians of the Mush and surrounding regions.

By 1888 Hamid's officials had grown bold enough forcibly to take two families of Armenians bound for the United States off a French ship at the Dardanelles. An appeal in this year to England elicited the reply that the Treaty of Berlin forbade interference in Armenia by any one Power singly. European diplomacy had stultified itself. Soon there was a brush between Armenians and Turkish troops at Erzurum (1890), followed by a small riot in Constantinople. In the same year also Andranik went into the Sasun district south of Mush where with a fugitive revolutionary band at his back he fought for fifteen years in the cause of his oppressed people's freedom. So far as the Turkish government was concerned, a small force of gendarmerie should have sufficed to put down these little uprisings and restore peace. But to restore peace was not one of its objects.

In 1891 war with Russia was imminent. Both Russia and Turkey massed troops on the frontier at Erzurum, where for months together the armies faced each other. Then as quietly the

forces were withdrawn. In the following year the Armenian patriot Damadian entered the Sasun district, followed by Boyajian (Murad). The revolt of Sasun followed (1894), as usual non-combatants being the main sufferers. Between 6,000 and 10,000 of them, without respect to age or sex, were butchered by the Turks, a sacrifice to European diplomacy.

News of the bloodshed having leaked out, England, France and Russia were constrained to take some sort of action to pacify the public indignation following. After many delays, they demanded of the Turk "reforms" (May 11, 1895). Reforms the Turk again granted, on paper, and executed once more with the sword. A massacre at Constantinople in which approximately 10,000 Armenians perished (September 30, 1895) served as the prelude to similar bloodshed all over the empire. Ak-Hissar, Trebizond, Erznga, Baiburt, Bitlis, Erzurum, Arabgir, Diarbekir, Malatia, Harput, Sivas, Amasia, Marsovan, Aintab, Marash, Cesarea and Urfa, in the order named, with their villages, to the number of approximately 2,500, became the scenes of carnage. About 650 villages were Islamized at the point of the sword. Upward of 550 churches, of which 50 were Protestant, were destroyed or plundered, and some 280 others were converted into mosques. To touch the nerve of the Powers, a band of daring revolutionaries seized the British and French owned Ottoman Bank at Constantinople. A second massacre in the city followed (August 26-28, 1896), with reverberations at other points. In none of these massacres was an accurate estimate of the loss of life possible, the less as the government covered up painstakingly every trace possible of the bloodshed. On a conservative estimate some 200,000 Armenians lost their lives in the course of three years, and upward of half a million were made homeless and robbed of all their worldly goods.

These massacres were a terrible blow to the Armenian people. Said one missionary of the American Board, "Politically everything but the deathless love of their race, their name, their history, and their religion seems to be swept away." Statistics of the Armenian Patriarchate reflect the general devastation. Ormanian upon his accession in 1896 found that of the 65 Armenian dio-

ceses of the empire but seven had bishops, and 20 temporary vicars, leaving 38 entirely unshepherded.

The proverbial resiliency of the Armenian people, however, did not fail them. "Here in Sivas city," wrote a missionary, "all our schools have enlarged, some doubled, recently having 700 students. The looted people pay tuition well." The people of Sasun themselves by 1904 had sufficiently rallied to rise again, this time under Andranik, in revolt, the insurrection being put down by 20,000 Turkish troops, with considerable loss on both sides. As usual the Turks avenged themselves on the non-combatants, in April and May of that year some fifty Armenian villages being wiped out. The Powers were apathetic.

Meanwhile the attitude of the Russian government itself had become thoroughly hostile. In the summer of 1903 an Imperial Ukase confiscated all Armenian Church revenue properties and placed them under control of the Ministry of the Interior. The object of the order was to deprive the Armenian clergy of funds they were suspected of contributing to revolutionary societies. The resistance of the Armenians of the Caucasus in defense of their Church's rights was universal, seeing that the government's action was a violation of the provisions of the Polojenye itself. Unfortunately at the critical moment the revolutionists stepped in and lent the contest a political coloring, occasioning retaliations on the part of the government, with the inciting of the Tatars against the Armenians. Race riots caused the country to run with blood. To the revolutionists' charge there were several political assassinations.

The aspect of things took a turn for the better following the assassination of Plehve, Minister of the Interior, in the summer of 1904. His successor, Prince Sviatipolk-Mirski, made it one of his first acts in office to dismiss the unpopular Governor-General of the Caucasus, Galitzin. The Japanese War then in progress rendered a conciliatory policy at home imperative. In the summer of 1905 another Imperial Ukase restored all confiscated properties and sanctioned the reopening of Armenian schools. In the court of the Armenian Cathedral of Tiflis, capital of Transcaucasia, 20,000 people attended services of thanksgiving led by the Catholicos Khrimian.

The one big bright spot in all this picture is the record of Christian philanthropy. The "Friends of Armenia," organized in Britain in 1896, gave in seven years for Armenia's 50,000 massacre orphans some \$220,000. Dr. Grace Kimball, American missionary physician at Van, through her industrial relief work, in 1896 was helping some 19,000 persons. By the middle of that year also, the International Relief Committee, of which W. W. Peet, American Board Treasurer at Constantinople, was chairman, had received from Armenians throughout the world, from Great Britain and the United States, for the relief of survivors, a total of over \$600,000, a sum that by the autumn of the following year was swelled to approximately \$1,500,000 from all sources.

World War Days

Then followed the entente between England and Russia, sealed by their respective monarchs at Reval (1907), putting the Young Turks again on their mettle. Abdul Hamid was now forced to restore the old Constitution (1908), and then deposed (1909). As by a fatality of events, the Turco-Italian war followed in 1911, and the Balkan Wars in 1912-13, conflicts in which Turkey suffered a series of costly and even disastrous defeats. Now at last, in the summer of 1913, at a Conference in London, Russia, with the co-operation of the other great Powers, initiated a scheme of reforms for the "seven" Armenian provinces of Turkey, imposed on the Turks on February 8 following. Two Inspectors-General were provided, the one to supervise the provinces of Erzurum, Trebizond and Sivas, the other those of Van, Bitlis, Harput and Diarbekir. The Inspectors-General were on their way to their posts when the world conflict broke out through Austria's declaration of war on Serbia, July 28, 1914.

Germany declared war on Russia on the first day of August, and simultaneously signed a treaty of alliance with Turkey. On October 1 Turkey abolished the galling "Capitulations," or special rights of foreign residents, and at the end of the month entered the war on the side of the Central Powers. To arouse Moslem fighting zeal both in and out of Turkey, the Sultan on November 13 proclaimed a Jihad, or Holy War. The proclamation, sanctioned and instigated by Germany, and futile in war, was

ominous for Turkey's native Christian population, as the Moslem, his fanaticism and avarice once aroused, always has had a way of avenging his reverses at the hands of Christian powers by the wholesale butchery of his own Christian subjects. Following their crushing defeat at Sarikamish, on the Caucasus front, in the winter of 1914-15, which Enver Pasha, Turkish Commander and Minister of War, blamed on the Armenian volunteers with the Russian forces, and following also the failure of the last great attack of the Allied fleets on the Dardanelles, March 18, 1915, the Young Turks then in power put their hand to the task of solving forever the problem of Christian minorities in the land. And first, in March and April, more than 500 Armenian villages were pillaged, and some 25,000 of their inhabitants put to the sword.

In the night of April 28-29 at Constantinople, and later at other points, all leading Armenians were placed under arrest. On May 20 Talaat Pasha, Minister of the Interior, issued a general order for the deportation of all Armenians, followed from time to time by special instructions similar in wording to those wired in September to the Governor of Aleppo, viz.: "It was at first communicated to you that the Government, by order of the Committee of Union and Progress, had decided to destroy completely all the Armenians living in Turkey. Those who oppose this order and decision cannot remain on the official staff of the Empire. An end must be put to their existence, however criminal the measures taken may be, and no regard must be paid to either age or sex nor to conscientious scruples."

Upwards of a million Armenians under this order were sent to their deaths. At five points only were the doomed people able to offer organized resistance, namely, Musa Dag, Shabin Karahissar, Sasun, Van and Urfa, the Turkish artillery at the last place being commanded by German officers. The rest, a defenceless population, were driven like sheep to the slaughter. Space forbids the telling in any detail of a story fully told in British Blue Books, by the American Ambassador of the day, Morgenthau, and by others.

As usual the clergy received first attention. "It is necessary," read one of Talaat's orders, "above all to work for the extermination of the Armenian clergy." The Bishops of Erzurum, Trebizond,

Cesarea, Bitlis, Mush, Sert and Erznga were all accordingly murdered. The Bishop of Diarbekir "was mutilated, drenched with alcohol, and burnt alive in the prison yard, in the midst of a carousing crowd of gendarmes, who even accompanied the scene with music."

In destroying the Armenian population, as a first step all men enlisted in the armies were disarmed, marched out in batches, made to dig their own graves, shot and buried. The younger adult males of the civilian population were segregated, and along the lines of deportation, in lonely valleys, done to death with clubs, axes, knives and bullets. The older men, with the women and children, thus deprived of their natural protectors, were driven on to ever receding destinations in the Mesopotamian deserts, abused along the way, abducted, robbed of their last piece of gold for a drink of water, left to die by the wayside. The martyr Church of the centuries was in its *via dolorosa*. The deportees, some accompanied by surviving pastors and priests, sang and prayed as they went to their doom. Their trails according to eye-witnesses were fairly covered with leaves of Bible and Prayer-Book fallen from dying hands. A Danish Red Cross nurse has given us a glimpse of the exiles from the region of Erzurum:

One day we met a convoy of exiles, who had said goodbye to their prosperous villages and were at that moment on their way to Kemakh Boghaz. We had to draw up a long time by the roadside while they marched past. The scene will never be forgotten by either of us: a very small number of elderly men, a large number of women—vigorous figures with energetic features—a crowd of pretty children, some of them fair and blue-eyed, one little girl smiling at the strangeness of all she was seeing, but on all the other faces the solemnity of death. There was no noise; it was all quiet, and they marched along in an orderly way, the children generally riding on the ox-carts; and so they passed, some of them greeting us on the way—all these poor people, who are now standing at the throne of God, and whose cry goes up before Him.

So early as February, 1916, there were in the Caucasus 220,000 refugees. "The ravages," advises a correspondent, "which disease

has wrought are noticeable in the fact that now the children do not number as many as the grown people." The Catholicos, George V, was then caring for the destitute with a generous appropriation from the Russian Government, supplemented by help from England and the United States. No small part of the work of human salvage was that done in the housing and schooling of a multitude of orphans. Of these, in 1917, there were 175,000, this number still daily swelled by the arrival of refugee children from the regions of Harput, Sasun, Bitlis, Mush and Erzurum. In April of this year the Americans opened an orphan center at Alexandropol (Leninakan), destined in a short time to become the greatest orphanage of the world, sheltering at one time as many as 20,000 orphans.

Once more now the Christian world began to pour out its sympathy and gifts for the survivors of Turkish savagery. In this necessarily Armenians in America were among the first. By the middle of 1915 they had sent to their families and friends in Turkey through the American Board alone \$163,000. By November of the following year this amount had swollen to \$313,481, the Board receiving from other sources for Armenian relief an additional \$94,554. By November, 1917, the American Board alone had sent to Turkey for relief purposes nearly a half million dollars. Meanwhile the American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief, organized in New York in 1915, had forwarded over \$2,000,000, the American Red Cross being a heavy contributor. Chartered by the American Congress in 1919 as the Near East Relief, the Committee handled during the fifteen years of its existence approximately \$90,000,000, of which \$28,000,000 was expended in the Caucasus area. During that time also Armenians in America contributed through the Armenian General Benevolent Union and the Near East Relief a total of \$2,500,000.

The Climax of Tragedy

But to return to the world conflict. The Armenians of Van who during the First World War five different times captured and surrendered again their native city, being finally deflected to Bagdad, in the summer of 1915 were masters of it. On February 15, 1916, the Russians captured Erzurum, and on the first day of

March following Armenian volunteers, vanguard of the Russian armies, entered Bitlis. These successes might have seemed to afford a measure of compensation for the failure of the ill-fated Gallipoli campaign ending early in January, 1916.

But already in August, 1916, the American missionary, Gracey, was leading another column of Armenian refugees from Van, 25,000 strong, along the road to the Caucasus. The following year, 1917, was a fateful one. On the first day of that year Turkey denounced the Treaties of Paris and Berlin, with the tutelage under which they had held her. On March 12 following, Russia lost Erzurum to the Turks. Three days later the last of the Tzars abdicated. On the first day of May, the Turks occupied Mush. The United States that meantime had declared war on Germany (April 6) and severed diplomatic relations with Turkey (April 20), seemed too far away materially to help the Allied and Armenian situation. With the Bolshevik revolution in November, the Russian resistance broke down completely. The armies of the Caucasus threw down their arms and went home, abandoning the Armenian frontier to the mercy of the Turk.

To cap the climax of disaster, Russia by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, March 3, 1918, ceded to Turkey the three provinces of Batum, Ardahan and Kars. Not content with occupying this territory that already had been surrendered to him by the Georgian President of the Federated Caucasian Republics (April 26), the enemy invaded Armenia. Vehib Pasha, "an energetic man," and a "determined and far-seeing leader," according to the German General, Liman von Sanders, and "a grim and fanatical Turk," according to Stuermer, crossed the Arpachai, and occupied Alexandrapol.

Nothing daunted, the Armenians proclaimed their independence of the Caucasian Federation (May 25, 1918), rejected the Turkish proposals for peace that would have made the Republic Turkish territory, and plunged into the unequal fight. James Arroll, an American relief worker who shared with them those days of war and famine, relates how the Armenians, under command of General Nazarbegian, with but one rifle to each seven men, were driven back by a well-armed and munitioned Turkish force of 50,000 regulars, inch by inch, to within six miles of their

own capital, Erivan, and how, coming out of their hand-scooped trenches (they had no shovels), they rallied to the attack at Karakilissé, and drove the enemy, outnumbering them as twenty to one, back a hundred miles toward his own border. And if it be asked how the Armenians could so fight, Arroll replies, "In those days it was a common sight to see Armenian women spiked by Turkish hands like moths through the bosom upon the sills of their own front doors."

An Armistice was signed, November 11, 1918, on the Western front, but it brought no respite to the Armenians. After that arrangement the British policed the Caucasus. But they blundered again, compelling General Andranik, then patrolling Zangezur with a small but effective force, to disband his army, and shipping all military stores at the important Armenian stronghold of Kars to Denikin fighting the Bolsheviks. The result was that the Turks captured Baku, and once more, with the aid of Tatars and Germans, perpetrated all the horrors of savage warfare; the provinces of Karabagh and Zangezur passed into Tatar hands, and the Armenian Republic, haven of refugees from Turkey, once more became the scene of Turkish butcheries. As a consequence of these conditions, in the spring of 1919, the country found itself in the throes of wasting hunger and pestilence.

The Aftermath

On August 10, 1920, the abortive Treaty of Sèvres was signed. It would have recognized a greater Armenia as a free and independent state, exhausted though it was by massacre, war and famine, and as General Harbord in the *World's Work* had warned, destitute of munitions of war. Despite Harbord's Report to the American Government in 1919 that he had seen no signs of an impending Turkish invasion, two months after the signing of the aforementioned Treaty, the Turks under Kara Bekir Pasha, armed with French and Italian long-range guns, once more invaded the Armenian Republic. On November 2 they captured Kars without a fight, along with some British munitions that had come too late, and on the next day occupied Alexandrapol. An armistice signed on the 7th day of the month was broken by Armenia's rejection of Turkey's demand for a Soviet state under

Turkish sovereignty. Fighting was resumed on the 18th, the hard pressed Armenians being the while engaged by the Tatars in their rear. On November 26 Soviet Russia ordered the Turks to halt, and in the night of December 2-3, while Russian forces were entering Erivan to set up a Soviet state, a second armistice was signed at Alexandropol marking the end of the diminutive war. A Russo-Turkish Treaty, signed at Moscow March 16 of the ensuing year annulled certain humiliating terms imposed by Turkey, and the Treaty of Kars, October 13, 1921, between Turkey and the Transcaucasian Soviet Republics, fixed the Arpachai as the western boundary of the little Armenian state, restored to Armenia Zangezur and Karabagh, and constituted Nakhichevan an autonomous province under the sovereignty of Azerbaijan.

In the meanwhile at the other end of the Armenian plateau Mustapha Kemal's Turkish Nationalists held the center of the stage. French policy in Cilicia since the Great War had been as vacillating and treacherous as Russian imperialistic methods had once been in Armenia proper. During the War the Allies had secured some 8,000 Armenian volunteers to fight for them in Syria on the promise of freedom for Cilicia as an Armenian state. After the European Armistice, however, the French in occupation of Cilicia alternately armed the Armenians against the Turkish Nationalists and disarmed and abandoned them to wholesale massacres. In February, 1920, some 20,000 Armenians were massacred at Marash, and in October of the same year 10,000 more at Hadjin. The French evacuation of Cilicia was not long delayed.

At the instigation of England the Greeks, landing at Smyrna May 15, 1919, commenced their offensive on that front June 22 of the following year. On September 10, 1921, began the decisive battle of Angora which sealed the doom of the Greek expedition. The fate of Cilicia now hung in the balance. Of fair promises the Allied premiers had always had an abundant supply, but it was noticeable that as respects the future of Armenia their promises were always as vague as they were fair. Briand in 1916 said: "When the hour for legitimate reparation shall have struck, France will not forget the terrible trials of the Armenians, and, in accord with her Allies, she will take the necessary measures to ensure for Armenia a life of peace and progress." How was this

pledge redeemed? On October 20, 1921, Franklin Bouillon, an emissary of Briand's own government, concluded at Angora an agreement whereby France promised, in return for certain Turkish concessions, and by January 4 following, the evacuation of Cilicia, with the surrender of all arms and munitions, uniforms and pack horses, to the value of 200,000,000 francs. It was evident that France and England, having won the war, were now spiting each other in the Near East. France at any rate was decidedly not "in accord with her Allies." Or perhaps San Remo (April, 1920) having granted her a mandate for Syria, she cared nothing more about the Greeks or the Armenians of Asia Minor. As to "concessions," everybody knows that "oil is thicker than blood."⁵³

In the Armenian population of Cilicia, the news of the Bouillon agreement, despite reassuring words from the French, caused nothing but consternation. In the space of a few days a hundred thousand Armenians fled the country. And so vanished another dream of a free and a greater Armenia. Of Turkish Armenia not one foot of soil were the Armenians given; they lost to the Turks some of their best lands in the Caucasus. So did the great Powers on both sides of the great conflict help and reward the Turk at the expense of a Christian nation. But no one in those days knew that Europe was no longer Christian, and neo-Paganism had not yet lifted its head. In less than a year's time afterward (September, 1922) the world witnessed the collapse of the betrayed cause of Greece, and the destruction by fire of the ancient Christian city of Smyrna. With the exchange of populations between Greece and Turkey (1923), the last remnants of Christianity were cleared out of Asia Minor, once, as Harnack has shown, the world's Christian land par excellence. In the circumstances Nansen could think of no better expedient. And Christendom seemed not to care. As Christian men in both East and West had for some time been declaring, Christendom had lost all Christian sentiment and solidarity.⁵⁴ The Treaty of Lausanne, ratified August 6, 1924, made the betrayal of the Christian cause complete.

Armenians Since

Since the First World War, more than ever before in their history the Armenians have been a scattered people, and, withal, a more compact. Between a million and a million and a half of their nationals were lost in the Turkish deportations, to say nothing about their losses on four battle fronts, in the Caucasus, in Syria, in Galicia and in France, where they gave fighting men by the hundred thousand.

There still are, as estimated, over two and a half million Armenians in the world, of whom but a trifle less than two millions are in Russian territory, in Soviet Armenia 1,200,000, in Georgia and Azerbaijan 600,000, and in northern Caucasus and greater Russia 120,000. There are said to be besides approximately 100,000 still in Asiatic and European Turkey, one-half of them at Constantinople, a mere fragment of the two millions or so before the War. Syria claims 150,000, Persia 100,000, and the United States another 150,000, of whom one-tenth are estimated to be Protestants. France, Rumania, Bulgaria, Greece, Egypt and Iraq have each between 25,000 and 50,000. Smaller colonies are scattered over Canada and Latin America, England, Belgium, Italy and Central Europe, Ethiopia and the Sudan, Palestine, India, Java and the Philippines.

In Soviet Armenia the situation of the churches seems more tolerable than in Russia at large. The Catholicate has been dispossessed of lands, buildings and revenues, all excepting the High Prelate's monastic residence and a hundred acres of fruit-land. Conventual libraries and treasures other than strictly religious have been transferred to the National Museum. All religious instruction other than parental, up to the age of eighteen, has been prohibited. Foreign missionary activities have not been allowed, and there have been signs in the past of the persecution of Protestant ministers. But atheistic disturbances have been infrequent, and no Armenian churches have been demolished.⁵⁵ In 1936 the clergy were given back the franchise, and in the present War (1945) the attitude of the State toward the Church has been more appreciative and conciliatory throughout the Soviet Union.

On November 12, 1932, Khoren Muradbegian was elected

Catholicos by an Ecumenical Synod meeting at Etchmiadzin. There were present 81 delegates, four of whom were women, and but seven from "abroad," from lands, that is, outside the Soviet Union. The Assembly was entertained at government expense, but for the first time in a century found itself unembarrassed by any government statute. Since the death in 1938 of the late Catholicos, the throne has been occupied by a *Locum Tenens*.

In New York, in the Church of the Holy Cross, before Mass, on Christmas Eve, 1933, the Archbishop Leontius Tourian, was foully murdered by political fanatics. The event afforded fresh proof that the National Church, even in a free country, was still experiencing difficulty in enforcing its demand for neutrality in political disputes. That act of desecration of the sanctuary, however, not only outraged the moral sense of all religious sections of the community, but already has made for the higher spiritual consecration of the people.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE ARMENIAN CHARACTER

PERHAPS no single people in the last half century have been more discussed than have the Armenians. Where they are spoken against, too often there is some sinister influence behind it. Sometimes the dispraise or vilification originates with, where it is not actually subsidized by, the Turk himself, bent upon redeeming the Turkish name from the universal opprobrium fallen upon it, who feels that in the same ratio he must needs defame the victims of his own barbarity. Sometimes it has a commercialistic origin, as when some foreign business adventurer goes East in the hope of making big money, runs up against Armenian competition, and vents his disappointed ire blackening the character of a whole people.⁵⁶ Some Armenophobia, too, has had railroad, mining, oil or other Turkish concession in view, or perhaps the negotiation of another Turkish loan on terms advantageous to the lenders, or the readjustment of policies of state in certain European cabinets, or the protection of vested interests as in the case of certain American educators. It may sometimes even have a semi-religious motive behind it, as when a missionary lets his zeal get the better of him in painting the darker side of the picture with the purpose of impressing the home constituency with the undeniable moral and spiritual need. Where he is not duped by Turkish official flattery or "generosity," the missionary is the merest victim of circumstances. For none who never has lived in Turkey will ever know the reign of terror missionaries along with others have lived under, knowing how, they might, like certain few of their number, be brought to grief by the most casual "indiscreet" word.

With the expressed opinions of prejudiced parties we here have nothing to do. It is always possible to tell the worst about any people, and as respects the Armenians this frequently has been done very plausibly. Writes a missionary after the Turkish Revolution: "The Armenian characteristics of selfishness, ignorance, pride, and quarrelsomeness are coming out as plainly under freedom as under tyranny."⁵⁷ The task we here set ourselves

is the more agreeable one of telling the best, telling, that is, not wherein Christianity has failed, but what it actually has effected for this unfortunate, and in many ways remarkable race. Specifically we must seek to discover what Christianity has actually done for the Armenian character, and what traits in particular of that character must be traced directly to the Christian tradition.

Perhaps we could do no better for this purpose than to take for our text certain words of Elsworth Huntington when he says: "The much-persecuted Armenians are peculiarly homogeneous, peculiarly distinct in racial character, and peculiarly strong in racial coherence. They are extraordinarily persistent, patient, and tenacious even to the point of being disagreeable. They have great capacity in business and in the handicrafts and arts. They have no mean standing in the more intellectual pursuits. They are conspicuously free from criminal inclination and the tendency to become a public charge. And with all this they are of a strong, tough, enduring physique."⁵⁸ The writer explains these elements of the Armenian character from the viewpoint of the sociologist and ethnologist by the laws of natural selection. It is our task to seek a further explanation here in religion.

There are three main elements of character indicated, namely, (1) tenacity, physical and moral; (2) homogeneity and coherency of race, and (3) native ability and proficiency in agriculture, arts and crafts, commerce and learning.

Armenian Tenacity

To begin with the first, namely, their tenacity. The Armenian race has survived sixteen hundred years of the most adverse conditions under which others have succumbed, and today it is as pure of blood, as free from disease, as "strong" and "tough" in physique as the best of races living. When it is recalled that this race has been more sinned against than any, not excluding the Jewish, the mere fact that it has survived will appear a remarkable proof of its stamina and moral fiber.

But when it is asked what has made them what they are, is there any other answer possible than that it is Christianity? To be sure, Christianity has brought upon them, wedged in as they have been between Moslem nations, the age-long persecutions of

their neighbors, but it should not be forgotten that Christianity alone has also preserved them a distinct people. If through the centuries they have maintained high home ideals, if by their respect for womanhood and childhood they have been kept free from vices to which their non-Christian neighbors always have been addicted, if, despite grinding oppression and demoralizing environment they have ever preserved intact certain high hopes, and kept their rising generations from a contact with the canker of moral corruption about them, what is the explanation of it all but Christianity?

Upon this people truly the centuries of Christian instruction have not been utterly lost if Christianity so far has entered into the fiber of the race that even some of their most unpromising specimens, when but given the opportunity, have reverted to the nobler type. Sir William Ramsay, by no means a blind admirer, has borne to the Armenians this testimony: "They have furnished the most striking examples known to me of capacity to receive and assimilate and rise quickly to the level of higher education and nobler nature, when the opportunity has been placed before them by other people."⁵⁹

Their persistency, even if sometimes perverted, itself is a distinctively Christian trait. Certain acute Chinese observers have termed persistency the one distinctive Christian quality. And, indeed, if to be pleasant and agreeable is not "the chief end of man," then the Armenian who can be tenacious to the point of being disagreeable may have an even chance to sanctity. Quarrelsome he at times may be, but the most quarrelsome Armenian of all is that one who has a principle to fight for, and, strange as it may seem in this mercenary age, will fight for it even though he lose his job or business in doing it.

Call it persistency, tenacity, perseverance, or what you will, it is this Christian quality that has made of the Armenian the "incorrigible optimist" he has been said to be. The missionary had observed that quality when writing in the December of 1920 of the doomed city of Aintab he said: "My first sight of the town affected me more than I can describe. The city is entirely surrounded and tightly shut in whilst shot and shell pass over our heads almost continuously, day and night. At present church

services are in charge of two laymen. Schools have been opened and are being well attended, the children passing safely through the streets between the fighting lines. The vitality, persistence, and resilience which characterize this people are marvelous. The present and the past combine to show that their spirit cannot be utterly broken, even by such adversities as perhaps no other nation ever had to contend with."⁶⁰

And it is this Christian quality also that explains the heavy price in blood the Armenian ever has been willing to pay for his faith (for a Roll of modern martyrs, see Appendix IV). After all, in this day when men are willing to die for everything but the faith, the best and surest index of a man's Christianity lies in the degree of his willingness to stake his life on it. Disagreeable a Christian may be, and martyrs are not always agreeable folk. Fight and fear have a common seat in the adrenal glands, and a race that throughout the centuries has been in constant fear sometimes may be excused for showing fight. And after all, a martyr is but a hero with his hands tied behind his back. But disagreeable or not, no man hath greater love for the Gospel than that he should die for it. And the annals of the past few decades are filled with the names of Armenians who have paid for their Christianity the supreme price.

Racial Solidarity

Of the Armenians' racial coherence it may be said that if to "love one another" be the one distinctive mark of the Christian brotherhood, then that coherence has certainly a Christian origin. Their common institutional Christianity is but the surface sacrament of which a common national heart is the underlying soul. This people who, from loss of contact with world politics, and from the peculiar circumstances of their geographical position and ethnic history, have been so singularly deficient in mutual co-operation, have a deeper sympathy each for all making them one family still.

In discussing the deeper aspect of the Armenians' racial coherence, we have something more to consider than the ethnic, the social or the commercial phase. Nothing will so test the solidarity of a people as the crucible of public disaster and war. How do

these Armenians act toward one another in trying times? Let Dr. Ussher, American medical missionary during the First World War, at Van, answer. "The Russians," he writes, "reported finding the villages full of dead bodies, and the rivers full of them, too. They sent out squads to burn these; fifty-five thousand bodies were cremated. . . . The soldiers brought more Turkish women and children and old men to us, until we had a thousand under our protection. . . . But the care of these thousand Turks was a far more onerous task than the care of the six thousand Armenians had been. . . . These people would not help each other as the Armenians had done; the contrast between the two sets of refugees, Moslem and Christian, was an exceedingly striking object lesson in the difference between the teachings of Mohammed and of Christ, and their effect on human character. The Armenians had been self-sacrificing, generous, helpful, and cheerful. These Turks were callous, indifferent to each other's sufferings, utterly selfish. . . . Very few could be got to do a hand's turn of work for the common good. They snatched away the daily ration of little children and hid it for some possible future need."⁶¹

But how did this racial coherency react toward other race units? Did the love of these Armenians for each other make them exclusive, or did it have the overflowing quality? How did they stand the supreme test of loving their enemies? A strange inquiry this in any purely ethnological study, it is legitimately applied here. "With the morning hours," says the same writer, "came sobering scenes, for search of the Armenian houses whose occupants had not succeeded in fleeing to the Armenian lines of defence before the siege—and there were many of these, very many in the heart of the Turkish quarters—discovered there Armenians with their throats cut, and wells filled with mutilated bodies. And all Armenian prisoners and Russian prisoners of war had been killed before the Turks fled. Small wonder that some of the men who saw these things should wreak vengeance on the Turks who had been left behind. . . . The Armenian refugees were rapidly leaving our premises. The fighting men were searching the city for hidden Turks, of whom they found quite a number, especially in a rather distant gypsy quarter. The men they put to death; the women and children they spared. . . . In this respect

the Armenians showed themselves far more humane than the Turks. In other respects they did not comport themselves in a manner worthy of the splendid spirit they had manifested during the siege. They burned and murdered; the spirit of loot took possession of them, driving out every other thought. . . . Much of this loot was only recovered plunder. And many would not injure a Moslem and restrained others, because, they said, we are Christians."⁶²

He who, friend or foe, maintains that if the Armenians and other Christians of the East had been better Christians they long since would have won the Turks and other Moslem races to Christianity, betrays an appalling ignorance of the religious situation in the Near East. We have already seen that it was not an innate desire for a superior type of religion, but the exigencies of war, utilizing every possible antagonism, religious included, that in the first place led Tatar and Turanian hordes to embrace Islam.⁶³ We do not need to attribute to the average Moslem an idealism that he does not possess. As for the Ottoman Turks, having used Moslem fanaticism to destroy Christianity, they had no more use for Islam, and promptly disestablished it (1928). Such people do not become Christians from conviction.

Eastern Christians had indeed the superior type of religion, and in its practical fruits the lowest type of Christianity will compare very favorably with the highest type of Islam. Certainly if the love of enemies be the highest expression of Christianity, the Armenians have had a high type of the faith. They have loved their enemies to their own hurt, though uniformly it has been a love lost, so inbred, so carefully nurtured, so implacable has been the hate it has been matched up against. One missionary testifies that the Armenians were kinder and more magnanimous to the foe than he would have been. Who ever heard of a Moslem soldier facing a firing squad for killing Armenian non-combatants? There is record of Armenian military discipline imposing the extreme penalty on men killing Moslem non-combatants. The Armenian physician, too, when the Turks sent his wife and little children on the long trek to the Arabian deserts to die, was dressing the wounds of the Turkish soldiery at the front. And the Armenian pastor, torn from his family, and marched off to a se-

cluded valley to receive the fatal shot, prayed that the blood of his people's myriad martyrs might some day yet prove the seed of a Turkish Church.

Honest Industry

Last of all, the Armenian native ability and capacity for honest work. This people, whose Church prides itself on its apostolicity, long since caught the spirit of the apostolic gospel of toil, "He that will not work, neither shall he eat." It has been said that since Nerses the Great, in the fourth century, established his poor houses, there have been no beggars in Armenia. Today a begging Armenian is an anomaly, two generations of massacres and relief notwithstanding. Without doubt a race that has a minimum of criminals and paupers must be an honest race.

That the Germans had a high opinion of the industry and intelligence of the Armenian farmer is evidenced by the fact that the war-time German government countenanced the Armenian deportations to the Arabian deserts partly, at least, as was said, in the hope of placing a capable race of tillers along the Bagdad Railway which otherwise never would have proved a paying venture. The world is well aware of the Armenian proficiency in the arts and the crafts, to which Turkey owes some of its finest specimens of the jeweller's trade, and its old capital some of its most beautiful palaces and mosques. The Armenians have also excelled in music. Deficient as an inbred race in what goes by the name of genius, they have been remarkably and uniformly gifted in all lines of thought and endeavor.

For the Armenian capacity for mental application we have competent German testimony. The writer is Martin Niepage, of the German Technical School at Aleppo, during the First World War. Comparisons may be odious, but he cannot help comparing the Armenians in this respect with their Moslem neighbors. "We," he says, "are told now in the German press, about the Turks' hunger for education, and of how they are thronging eagerly to learn German. There is even a report of language courses for adults which have been started in Turkey. They have certainly been started, but with what result? One reads of the language course at a technical school which began with twelve Turkish

teachers as pupils. Our informant forgets to add, however, that after four lessons only six pupils presented themselves; after five, five; after six, four; and after seven only three, so that after eight lessons the course broke down, through the indolence of the pupils, before it had properly commenced. If the pupils had been Armenians they would have persevered till the end of the school year, learnt industriously, and finished with a respectable mastery of the German language."⁶⁴

So much has appeared in print by way of specimen instances of petty Armenian dishonesty that one wonders if these stories, like "Scotch jokes," are not a temporary craze. Touching on his rounds but the fringe of society, the traveller has the best of chances to see society at its worst. Often he himself invites what he expects, and then, perchance adds, like Dr. Ramsay, his own little anecdote to the general fund. Apparently no one has ever heard of the Armenian real estate appraiser who refused a bribe lest "his heart should broil on a spit for the rest of his life"; or of the partner in business who punctiliously turned over to his deceased partner's children their full inheritance though it was his own secret alone; or of the man of Arroll's tale, one of 10,000 refugees by their labor supporting 60,000 others, who alone betrayed his trust, misappropriating \$2,750, which he voluntarily afterward confessed and offered to restore if it took him the rest of his life to do so. Such stories apparently are not "news," and are overlooked accordingly.

Like that of any individual, the character of a race should be judged, not alone by, but in its environment. It were a mistake to judge an Armenian in any other light than the land in which he lives. Should not the opinion of surrounding races be taken as a fair gauge of the Armenian character? Is it without meaning that for the last three hundred years it has been a proverb in Persia that "an Armenian will not lie"? In Turkey, the common Moslem would at any time rather put his money in custody of an Armenian than of a Turk, and whether it was a case of supervising the royal mint, or of reforming the postal administration, it was always an Armenian, not a Turk, that was entrusted with the task.

But to come closer home. Armenians have proved themselves

uniformly a constructive force in American life. They have been among our best farmers and fruit growers, and have distinguished themselves in industries and commerce, in the arts and crafts, in literature and learning, in the applied sciences and in medicine. They have been on good terms with the law, at least one investigator of prohibition days finding that whoever else was not obeying it, the Armenians were. And their clergy today are here as elsewhere more efficient and better equipped than ever. In war time, too, their loyalty to our country has ever been above suspicion. Pacifists among them would be abnormal. They have poured out in two wars without stint both blood and gold for America.

In the European theater of war their part has been no negligible one. They have contributed in various ways to a mutual understanding between Russia and the United States in the Second World War. To the Soviet forces they gave some thirty generals and 150,000 fighting men, nor does it seem without significance that when the German invader approached the confines of Soviet Armenia, he quickly turned and fled. But the time is ominous. After the First World War, having fought shoulder to shoulder with the Allies, as we have seen they were betrayed by their friends. Will they be betrayed again? For the Turk, now that a Second World War has come and gone, having played in it his own inglorious part, once more pushes his sinister propaganda, expecting to find again in Western capitalists and politicians ready listeners and powerful accomplices. Nor is it to be overlooked that England has never renounced the Cyprus Convention, by which she is bound as Turkey's defender. The while God looks on. One thing seems certain. Until the Great Powers discover some effective way of terminating their sacrifice of the little peoples to the Moloch of their own doubtful "interests," future world peace is in no wise assured, no, or even that Western statesmen have any sincere desire for it at all.

APPENDIX I

AN EPISTLE OF GREGORY OF NAREG ON THE PAULICIANS

THIS letter, of which a translation is given also by Conybeare in his *Key of Truth*, is addressed to the Abbot of the Monastery of Gjav, upon whose inmates, as once upon the writer himself, the reflection of Paulicianism had been cast. It conveys the horror and prejudice in which the Paulicians were held. The personal allusions of the letter need no comment, except the reference near the end to a certain correspondence between Sahak (Isaac) and Petrus. Sargisian, in his notes accompanying the original text (Venice, 1893), mentions a letter of Isaac III, Catholicos from 677 to 703, which is supposed to answer to the character of the letter here mentioned. But if the letter in question was written, as in the present rendering, by Petrus instead of Isaac, then the extant letter referred to by Sargisian does not help us to an identification of the writer. Who was this Petrus? We must look for two prelates bearing severally the names of Peter and Isaac who were contemporaries in office. Is it possible that Sahak is a copyist's error for Shahak, a prelate by the latter name being the first Armenian Catholicos, of the House of Albianus, to be consecrated independently of the primate of Cesarea, by local Bishops? If so, then the identification would readily explain Shahak's resort to an ecclesiastical court higher than that of Cesarea, Petrus II, Archbishop after Athanasius of Alexandria, from 373 to 380. Shahak was Catholicos from 373 to 377, and therefore was a contemporary in office. If this identification of the two prelates be correct, the anachronism of "Chalcedonites" will be explained as a loose designation of Gregory's own for "orthodox," a conjecture, judging by what otherwise we know of the writer's own doctrinal views, not at all forced.



Lord Father: That which I write, though it relates to a report seemingly incredible, from evil-intentioned sources, will not, see-

ing that my informants are reputed reliable men without appearance of spite-work, be deemed controversial. It has come to my ear that that unmentionable, most disgusting filthiness of heresy of the accursed Tonrakians in truth is known among you of pure mind, and I am lost in wonder at such an impossible attitude on your part toward a people hateful to God as that you should, as report has it, magnify the name for learning of that man Mushegh, saying, "We are informed by messenger sent out from us that they are not strangers to the confession handed down by the Apostles," and should desire with great desire to be partakers with them of their lot and to mix your blood with the blood of those who were massacred by the sword of that avenging infidel, the Emir Abul-Vard, who proved himself indeed a rod of anger in the hand of the Lord Jesus, and all this too knowing full well by what writings and whom he enjoins you to anathematize, while you describe that wonderful, blessed controversial letter of our Lord Ananias (of Nareg) as being only empty words, ill-timed, and spoken in no godly spirit. And if these opinions are broadcast by you, not to say approved by you, and I refrain from saying relished by you, then surely that which is written is fulfilled in your midst, "Their savory meats have become vile."

Much, rather everything, that is divine and apostolic, is by them denied and excluded from the divine ordinances. Ordination, which the Apostles received from Christ; the communion of His body, of which the Apostle said that by eating the bread thereof we receive and eat God himself in the flesh, and which that terrible teacher, Smbat, calls a common meal; the birth through spiritual pangs of the water and the Spirit, which brings forth as hath been preached children to God, he hath taught them to be nothing but bath water; and the blessed Lord's Day, on which God the Word created the pristine light, on which also He suffused the light of his own Resurrection, and on which finally He dispensed the light of His life-giving Parousia, that type of the adorable Day, he hath taught them as being on a level with other days.

And now for things not of apostolic or of divine appointment, which we know them to have abolished. Genuflexion in sacramental prayer, which Jesus Christ, Creator of all things, himself

humbly observed; the Baptismal font, which they repudiate, but in which Christ himself was baptized; the fellowship of Immortality which the Lord of all things himself tasted. And what shall we say of their promiscuous immoralities, whereas the Lord forbade so much as a look; their contempt for the adoration of the Cross which God made Man lifted up upon his shoulder and carried as his glory and as the sign of his authority; their man-worshipping apostasy, more revolting and cursed than idolatry; their contemptible self-conferred priesthood bearing the semblance of the Devil; their belittling of the marriage rite which the Lord in person, by a miracle, and in the company of His God-bearing Mother regarded and honored, which rite they make light of, holding that the love of those mated by love in itself is perfect and of God and well-pleasing to Christ, and that God is Love, and wills that consorts shall be united by love and not by a marriage rite; their jocular witticisms on the offerings of first-fruits, which Abel and Noah, Abraham and David, Solomon and Elias do show to be appeasing of the divine wrath; their audacious speaking of the head of their foul sect as Christ, even as afore-time Christ himself declared that there would arise false prophets, and the Prophet indicated the same by saying, "The fool hath thought in his heart that there is no God."

Such then are the "apostolic canons of the unerring faith" laid down by your inquiring Mushegh! These baseless blasphemies of the lawless Tonrakians have been cast down by our own Uncle and Teacher, speaking as another wise champion of God, having scrutinized them with a careful discrimination, else this unclean people had been known to us in but a limited degree and by common fame only. What gifts of election, pray, have they seen in this disgusting Cumbricius (Mani), what memorial of good in this Simon (Magus), what hope of expectation in this Anti-christ, who have discipled themselves to them, and, having clean forgotten the unspeakable benefits of the Passion, do call to their defence such as have received what they have from the like of these, tribes of dogs and gangs of thieves, packs of wolves and throngs of devils, clans of robbers and bands of raveners, hordes of barbarians and mobs of crucifiers, assemblies of wicked and bloody men, swarms of poisonous snakes, herds of man-faced wild

beasts, and courts of magician sectaries contemptible not alone to churchmen but to pagans as well?

For, too, that man in authority who already had wreaked vengeance on his cursed predecessors for their contumelies of Christ by putting them to an ignominious death, said thus to that second Jambres himself: "Christ rose after three days; now seeing that you call yourself Christ, I will slay and bury you, giving you thirty days in which to rise again, and if you will only rise after so many days, then I shall know for a certainty that you are Christ." Now this man was a close neighbor to those people embittered by folly, and derived his information from many witnesses, and as he thoroughly believed in the truth of Christ's Resurrection, he made sport of their teachings as only deserving of ridicule, leaving behind him a memory of praiseworthy words. For he had been planted of God and not by any earthly hand, it having been ordained that through a wicked man like him the wicked should be either admonished or slain, even as God gave for food the great Dragon of India (cf. Job 40:20, 25 of the Armenian Bible), and admonished the Jews by the Chaldeans, and the crucifiers by Titus, judged and brake in pieces both Vespasian and Hadrian, and punished the nation of the Egyptians a second time by overthrowing them through Cyrus, yes, and Belial himself is called the great chastising rod suspended in the Temple of the Ordinances of the Most Awful One. But whereas even the devils acknowledged the Only-Begotten One as God, confessing Him Judge of all, foul Smbat, a second Simon (Magus), caused his own disciples, sprung from a root of bitterness and from tares, to render worship to himself, as to another Magician of Samaria, a Montanus, or a Pythagoras, unlettered pagan philosopher.

I have written thus little out of much, and few things out of many, and shall await your word, for before you lies the canon of the divine law, "By thine own words thou shalt be justified, and by thine own words shalt thou be condemned." And if you wonder at their citing scripture, we are well aware that the Devil, too, on that day of the Temptation of the Savior of Men, quoted from the Psalm. But if you will not pronounce a twofold curse with many anathemas on the memory of their originator, Smbat,

on their dead, and on their magicians' religion and confession; will not also put down their pretense of goodness as twice refuse and a denial of the faith, nor by a return letter indicate how we may know you to be blameless, removing thus from the midst a stumblingblock, at least you will know and understand that I have written to you with a view solely to your well-being, your peace, and your love. But verily if that fortress of refuge (*sc.* the Monastery of Gjav) be betrayed by its keepers, then you do but betray your own good name. As for ourselves, that man Mushegh accounts himself as a teacher, and it therefore behooves us to arm ourselves as a champion against the foe, to repair the breach and to defend that which is weak, yea, to be according to the divine command, both light and salt, and counsellor of him who is darkened in his mind. For if that which you might think to be in him light be indeed darkness, then in very truth he is a snake-bitten charmer and a witless dispenser of drugs. Indeed knowledge that is not confirmed by the finger of God is but a noxious sound of words, in influence untoward, a treacherous message destroying peace.

And now, pray, what does that man know when he says, "By what scripture do they anathematize whom?" Paul did not hesitate to anathematize any strange and unthinking angel, yea, to repeat the anathema, while David in like manner cursed them who had gone astray and confirmed the curse with rebukes. As to the Lord himself, to all on his left hand, being deserters, he says, "Depart from me, ye cursed." Sectarian unorthodoxy, as we have received and learned from the Confession, twice read, following the Gospel, is anathema by the Holy Council of Nicaea. The return reply to Sahak's Letter of Answers to Petrus commends words of anathema against all those separating themselves from the Chalcedonites, while Cyril of Alexandria's anathematisms against Nestorius, and the Emperor Zeno's Henoticon alike and equally anathematize all sectaries. Now if we are enjoined to anathematize those partially deficient, how much more must we anathematize the ranks of that congregation of many errors entirely severed from Christ and bound and joined to Satan!

And now, Lord Abbot, do take no offence at the language of

this letter, nor judge the sincere love that inspires it to be hatred. For in these matters the love of Christ constrains us, and we would have you blameless. As to that well-informed book of the Abbot Ananias that with painstaking care he has written against these same sectaries, be sure to have it copied.

APPENDIX II

TRACTATE OF JOHN OF OTZUN AGAINST THE PHANTASIASTAE

THE following tractate is by John of Otzun, surnamed the Philosopher, one of Armenia's best known Catholici. It is directed against a heretical leader who, under Arab protection, openly antagonized "confessions, orders, religion and everything else." A tract of this arch heretic is more than once cited by John.

Our writer gives here a complete statement of Armenian Theology, Christology and Soteriology. He constantly employs the Armenian term for "nature" in the sense indiscriminately both of nature and of substance, and makes it clear that the doctrine of the "one nature" in the Armenian position is not to be, any more than the Western doctrine of "two natures," unduly pressed. Each has its own danger, each must correct the other.

Of the saving death of Christ, the Armenian Soteriology has no explanation to offer other than the patristic one. He humbled himself, that we might be exalted (mysticism); and he suffered for sin to teach us how to suffer for our own sins (moral influence). From this last doctrine proceeds the whole system of Church penances and absolutions.

The Armenian text here used is that published at Venice in 1833, based on a manuscript dated 1298, and in turn copied from an earlier exemplar once owned by the Catholicos Gregory II (1066-1105).



To myself it were most to be coveted and desirable that neither I might be found in antagonism to others, nor yet others toward me, but that together we might pursue the good at all seasons, seeking according to the apostolical injunction to be at peace with others and with all men from the heart, to the end that the God of love and peace might be pleased to dwell in us. But forasmuch as having been commanded in the beginning to put away all instruments of murder, men once more contrariwise have taken

them in hand and are fighting each other, and, instead of the One Head of the members, even Christ, many heads and chiefs have set themselves up, it behooves us who have chosen to take the Only One for the Captain and Bishop of our souls, not alone to esteem ourselves as God's possession, but also in his name to take up the pen, in his name to raise the battle-cry, yea, in his name to hate them who are hateful unto Him, verily to hate them with a perfect hatred.

Unto them I will say, even as doth the Prophet, "Ye shall not live, seeing that ye have spoken falsely in the name of the Lord." And what sort of falsehood could be worse than denying Christ to have come in the flesh, which the great John attributes to the Deceiver and the Antichrist? For they of whom we are speaking so far refine and sublimate matters in both their meditations and their speeches on the body of Christ, that they convey the notion that the Word made flesh was a somewhat in appearance only, so far that is as their words convey any meaning at all. For they are not willing to say of all the fleshly passions of Christ that they were according to the flesh or in the flesh, lest, they declare, they should convey the idea of two natures in the one Christ, for, say they, it was God the Word himself who appeared as both the human and the divine.

I am astonished at such dubious and lame views. For if Christ could indeed bear the passions of the flesh without the flesh, why then did he at all assume flesh of the Virgin, by a nine months' gestation, and appear, being born, as an infant? "Ye shall find," it is said, "a babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, and lying in a manger"; and, "who was born of the posterity of David according to the flesh"; and, "of whom also was Christ according to the flesh"; and, "Great is the mystery of godliness revealed in the flesh." It says also, "The sufferings of Christ in the flesh," and, "Though he died in the flesh, yet he liveth in the spirit." But, albeit an involuntary blindness longs to see the unseen, a voluntary blindness will choose not to see the things that are plainly visible!

"But," say they, "he did not become flesh *of* the Virgin, but *in* the Virgin." And this they do lest by saying "*of* the Virgin," they should suggest or introduce our own very nature. In saying "*in* the Virgin," they maintain that it was God the Word himself that

was made flesh in the Virgin's womb. But I must ask of them: Do you attribute the Incarnation to the Word in his own nature, or do you hold that it lay in a union with ours? If he came by this mundane mode of existence in his own nature only, then was he dissevered from the manhood in which he had his being, and our hope of salvation is vain. But I do think that your minds are occupied in fact with something else when you thus simulate. What wilt thou make of the voice of the Archangel when he says, "He who is to be born *of* thee," not "*in* thee"? And of this: "God sent his Son, who was made *of* a woman"? And this: "God was sent of God, and took spirit and flesh *of* a Virgin"? And this: "Christ was born *of* a Virgin; be ye, ye women, therefore, virgins"? And this: "He was born *of* Mary, the Holy Virgin"? I am aware that thou hearest these things, but dost not heed, to the end that thou, son as thou art of disobedient fathers, mayest perish.

But if your immature words originate in a fear of doubtings, you are like unto them that flee from the terror of the sword only to die by a fall from a precipice. Fearing, I mean, to speak of "two natures," you flee from that error but to fall into the folly of Pandareos (*sc.* Theodore of Mopsuestia), who prated of the Word being changed into flesh and bones. For if ye know not how to discern with the mind's eye the evangelic word, "The Word was made flesh," ye will not be able to avoid the aforesaid blasphemy.

Likewise, if ye say "one nature," but not, as it should be said, according to the truth, then will ye find yourselves with another class of dogs that speak blasphemies. For in order to be able to say this, all lovers of Christ must needs first have their minds' eyes illumined. For the nature of the flesh, and the nature of the Word, are not one by any identity of natures, the twain being neither both human, nor yet both divine. Neither, I mean, did the flesh come down from heaven, as in the babblings of the first Eutyches, nor God the Word derive his being from Mary, as Photinus seemed to hold, but the uncreated Word, coming down from the uncreated Father, assumed an acquired flesh of the Virgin's womb. Wherefore the unity of nature does not derive from any identity of natures; for if we say, "one is the nature of the Incarnate Word," it is by no means with the foolish and meaning-

less intent that the one was derived from the other, or that they were distilled the one from the other like some liquid elements, which certainly argues no identity of natures. But we mean that that which was, without being laid aside, became that which it was not, thus being revealed the humility of the Highest. Abiding in the highest, it at the same time was found in humiliation, even as says St Gregory: "Thus he came down for us unto humiliation, yet doth he continue and abide in his own nature, even as he himself said, 'I am the same, and change not.'" There thus was revealed, besides, our own greatness, in that, being in the form of servants, we put on the form of the heavenly. And this, too, the Savior himself affirmed when he said, "I came that ye might have life, and might have more of it." I came, that is, not to take away that which was bestowed in the beginning, even the gift of being, but to add thereto those things that are more divine. For the Creator came not down to mar the creature that he himself had made, but to recreate and to renew him. And thus that which already each was, severally the human and the divine, became thenceforward predicable, without being laid aside, through the union of substances, of that which aforetime had not been united to it. That is, God the Word, while becoming Man and being known as such, remained God, and Man, in becoming God and being known as such, thereby lost not his own substance. Even as the blessed Ephraim (Syrus) says: "He did not change the flesh into incorporeality, but has his own Body even more truly than we do our own, seeing that it was born of the Virgin and united to God the Word."

Now it is patent that it is the inscrutable union, and not any mutation in the natures, that leads us to say "one nature" of the Incarnate Word. This likewise affirms the highly gifted Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, when he says, "The Word was not changed into the nature of the flesh, nor was the flesh changed into the nature of the Word, but each, while continuing and being known in the properties of its own nature, manifests, in conformity to the doctrine handed down to us of the inscrutable and ineffable union, the nature of the Son to be one." Now to speak of "the properties of its own nature," is to imply that each (nature) is constant in that which it possessed in the beginning. At the same

time, owing to the inscrutable mystical union, nothing hinders our affirming a unity of everything in Christ, who is one person, one self, and one nature. For He who was the incorporeal Word from the Father, assumed flesh of Mary, the Holy Virgin, that is to say, of our own human nature, and uniting it with his own person and nature, became as we say, one person and one nature, including his flesh. He did not assume what was ours as somewhat non-real or destitute of a rational mind or self, devoid of a proper nature, of the woman; but, rendering it in all respects perfect, He, even the Word from the Father, united it with his own perfection, wherefore He is (properly) said to be one perfect being, possessed of one soul and one personality. I do not deny the perfections of the two natures in view of their union, and neither in view of the perfections of the two natures do I decline to acknowledge the perfection of the unity, but confess a unity in immutability, and an immutability in unity.

To say it then briefly, the one nature or the one person of Christ does not consist in an identity of natures, or a uniformity of personality. For this would render the incarnation of God and the deification of man alike impossible. But it consists, as I have said, in the ineffable union of the Word with his own body. Even as St Gregory says: "He was united with the fleshly nature, and assumed the flesh into his divinity." Thus it is owing to the ineffable and inscrutable blending and union, and not for any other reason that we venture to say, "one nature in Christ." The same saith the blessed Julius, Patriarch of Rome: "Whosoever declares created flesh, by being united to the uncreated God, became divine and adorable, and the union of the twain one uncreated God, let him be blessed." He has a word of blessing equally for both the confessing a union of the twain according to natures, and the confessing a unity resulting from the said union. Let us not then in saying "one," presume to stop up the fountains of the several natures, nor let us by saying "the union of the twain," rend asunder the seamless robe, but knowing well how to contemplate in piety both facts together, let us recognize the diversity of natures from their unity, and ascend to the unity from their diversity. As says the wonderful John (Chrysostom), of Constantinople, "I confess a unity; not a dissolving or dissolution of

this nature into that, or of that nature into this, but their unification, their union." Now as I have already said, this union means the coming into a unity of the seen and the unseen, and not their co-substantiality. Where this is not, that must needs be.

But this also we hear you say: "I affirm one nature of the Divine, of that namely which he had from the Father, that is, his own nature; for we do not speak of the nature of creatures, forasmuch as the Creator alone has a nature, while the body of Christ is simply the body and not the nature of Christ." I reply: Dost thou then avoid the name "nature," and with it the term, "of the two," and not know that in saying "flesh" thou art caught in both of the things from which thou fleest? Now the very same things in which thou thinkest to be pious, those same I will set up as a witness against thee. In calling the flesh "the flesh of the Word," and in saying that "the Word has flesh," what else thinkest thou to affirm than that there is a duality? And again, in asserting that the Word is from the Father, thou attributest to him the nature of the Father; whose nature dost thou affirm he hath if not of man, in saying that the flesh was of man? But it does seem to me that you do not even intend to say, "the body of Christ," for if you did confess Christ to have in truth a body, and that of man and human, you scarcely would scruple to say of it that it was "human nature." For it is the same thing whether Christ had a human body or a human nature, and without the union, Christ would not be properly called Christ Jesus, but God the Word. As says St Basil: "If someone affirm that the flesh is of the nature of the Word, or that the Word is of the nature of the flesh, either saying is full of impiety."

And if thou art constrained to confess that the one and the same Christ is of two natures, namely a divine and a human, why be terrified and enraged by that, with strange and blasphemous words confusing the ears of the pious? For thou sayest, "Whatsoever his person begotten of the Father, the same assumed personality from the Holy Virgin, and, whatsoever his nature derived from the Father, the same he derived in the Virgin's womb." But thanks be to God who reveals the hidden depths of darkness, and brings to light the shadows of death! For although thou didst hugely try in devious ways to cover up and to conceal the ac-

cumulated gall of thy bitterness, yet now at last, constrained by the divine providence, thou hast spewed it all out. Pray how did the selfhood of the Son assume personality in the Virgin? Forsaking his own being, did he assume another state of being besides, as in the opinion of Pandorus (*sc.* Eutyches, a male Pandora), who declares that continuing still in his own nature, he invested himself with a phantasmal form bearing the likeness of ours, acquired from the Virgin in appearance and outward form only; or in that of the second Eutyches (*sc.* Jacob Zanzalus), who foolishly babbles saying, "I confess God the Word to have assumed in the Virgin's womb figure and impress in the image and form of man, but not that he mixed with himself aught of the creaturely nature, for the Deity is without admixture and without parts"? Seest thou how you twain agree in impiety? Thou sayest, The self of the Son assumed personality from the Father in the Virgin, and he says, He mixed nothing from the Virgin with his unmixed Deity.

But if the Word did not unite with himself in the Virgin any personal substance of ours, how then does it come that he called himself both Man and the Son of Man? How, too, did he manifest himself as an infant, was wrapped in swaddling clothes, was suckled, and grew up in stature to maturity, as in that orthodox confession of the great Athanasius? "So much of nature," he says, "as was commanded, so much, that is, as he willed, he perfected and took upon himself, namely, his birth of a woman, his growth in stature, the number of his years, his toil, his thirst and hunger, his sleep, his sorrow, his death and his resurrection." Do all these appear to thee as but similitudes and phantasms that Christ displayed, or as facts? If they be all of them facts, as indeed they are, for it were impossible for God who cannot lie to make a pretense of his works in untruth, how can you say that the invisible and incorporeal self of the Son assumed personality in fleshly form in the Virgin's womb, and yet refuse to say that God the Word, sent of the Father, received our true nature from the woman and joined it to himself?

"If," they declare, "we should affirm this last, we would be maintaining two personalities and two natures." Again fleeing from a vain fear, thou fallest into a greater evil! For if thou art

unwilling to say of the one that as respects nature it is of two, then thou wilt be found grievously to err in speaking of the one as nature at all. For the incorporeal nature of the divine Word, receiving the fleshly nature from the Virgin, united it to himself, the result as respects the natures being twofold, divine and human, and as respects the union, unitary. Wherefore if thou art not confirmed in the truth, standing at once upon both these two most beautiful feet of the faith, whichsoever of them thou shalt bear down upon, thou surely wilt be found lame in the confession of the truth; perfect only if thou wilt give heed to both alike, confessing in the union one perfect person and one Son of God, as does St Basil when he says, "The union of two perfect substances."

In reply to which, arming thyself against it, thou writest in thy book, "He who derives his nature from the Father, the same took his nature from the Holy Virgin." But if there was already a nature from the Father, what other nature, pray, came then into being in the Virgin's womb? Think, in saying that, into what vortex of terrible blasphemies thou sinkest! The holy Fathers assembled at Nicaea say, "The same nature of the Father, for our salvation, was born a human being of Mary the Holy Virgin, by the Holy Spirit." After which they enumerate in order the perfections of our own nature, spirit, body and mind, and add that ascending with the same body to heaven, he also is to return with the same body. But thou sayest, "The same nature that derived from the Father derived from the Virgin's womb, for which cause we say, 'one nature.'" But if it derived from the Virgin's womb, then certainly it did not derive from the Father. And again, if first it began to be one nature with the Father in the Virgin's womb, it follows that before its humiliation to the Virgin's womb, it was a stranger to the Father's nature. And in thus blaspheming thou art but found to be repeating the impiety of Arius.

Again, thou sayest that the "one nature" is affirmed (by you) as against those who teach "two natures." Now whosoever teaches two natures means the divine and the human; which one of these, which mode, meanest thou when saying "one"? With such irrational reasoning dost thou prate, not knowing how to discover the plain ways of God. For God the Word, when coming into being with a human nature from the immaculate womb of the Virgin,

inscrutably united to his own substance and nature that which before was not, as also one of the saints has said: "I have known the fact of the flesh through the union with the Word, whence it were proper to say 'one person,' and 'one nature' " of the Word made flesh. Not in its essential being is it one nature and entity (for that God the Word received from the Father before all time), but according to the ineffable incarnation by the Virgin. As says St Basil: "That being which was born of Mary and of her nature was not in nature God, but God by a union through incarnation; for that which was of the nature of the Father, even God the Word, took from the nature of Mary the image of a servant, and was found made the fruit of her womb." Thus saith he. It was not therefore the divine nature that was derived from the Virgin's womb, as thou babblest, but God the Word from the Father took unto himself human nature through a woman. As says also the great Athanasius: "For it was our human nature that was born, whence also it follows that that suffered." So this Father.

But thou, if thou sayest that the Word who was from the Father became in truth man of man, wherefore dost thou fear to confess the human nature of Christ, and art confused in thy words, rushing from one vain reflection to another? Thou fearest to say, "of two natures"; there is grave reason for fear that thou wilt not even say, as thou shouldest, "one nature," in Christ. But if in true piety thou wilt attend to both, there is nothing to prevent that in saying "one," thou also shouldest bear in mind, "of the twain," and again, not overlooking "of the twain," shouldest confess the "one." For the holy Fathers themselves built upon this foundation of the orthodox faith, with a reasoning both firm and steadfast, when, handling both of these weapons true, they used each according to the need of the hour, flourishing and flashing each in turn against the enemies of the truth, against, that is, them severally who following either Eutyches, or Julian (of Hali-carnassus), falsely understood and confessed but "one," designedly setting forth their doctrines with a duplicity of words, each one of the teachers named pointing the other to a mind more orthodox than either.

The tree is known by its fruit; and the flower by its root. Dost thou ask of the flower? It is identified by the name of the root.

Eliminate the name, and thou hast no word for it, and word and name failing, thou wilt be at a loss to identify the sight of the color, the fragrance of the smell, and the taste. By the same analogy thou mayest understand the Savior's body, reasoning from the name of the species ("The Man Christ Jesus"), to the sight ("Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having"), to the human passions ("Forasmuch as he suffered, being tempted, he is able also to succor them who are tempted"), and to his death in the body for us ("Christ died for us according to the scriptures").

Wherefore, if "one" do not bring thee to reason, go on inquiring step by step, and thou wilt be convinced that the Lord's body was of the same substance and of the same nature with ours, and confessing him thus of two natures, thou wilt own him as both God and Man. But in saying, as ye actually all do, that he is of "one nature," thou designatest him by the absolute name; and how, then, canst thou say that he became man and died, or caused by his death the gift of immortality to flow to usward? The holy Fathers, therefore, without fear of obloquy, maintained in Christ two natures, a divine and a human. They said "two natures," for that he was both God and Man, the natures coexisting in him. And in very truth Christ hath both natures, for Christ is two, a visible man, and an invisible God. Others besides have said similar things. Not that in saying he was of two natures they denied that he was of one, or that on the other hand in confessing the one nature they stubbornly refused to confess him of two natures. But courageously they bore aloft both those lamps of orthodoxy, proclaiming Christ according to the natures two and according to the union one (from which it appeared that the nature of God the Word was from the Father and uncreated, while the substance of his body was from the Virgin and created), saying, "I do not understand the words of the evangelists to be all of equal importance, or this particular saying to represent their whole intent; one passage indicates the majesty of his Deity, while another sets forth his condescension to the lowliness of man"; and, "Here is his passible flesh and his impassible Deity." And, let it be noted, the same writer that in one place designates him in his deity impassible, in another loudly proclaims God as having suffered. How now are we to under-

stand these things? Shall a man contend with his own teachers? Nay, but they reason after the first fashion according to the nature, and after the second according to the union of the Word (*scil.* with human flesh). When they speak of the union, they do not mean to deny the common humanity; nor when they speak of the common humanity do they mean to divide the union into two several entities. But approaching both in a devout spirit, they deem the passible common clay to be in the union impassible, and the impassible in substance in virtue of the union to be infinitely passible.

Other holy Fathers after the same manner have placed their confession on record. When called upon to speak of the natures, they boldly posited those things which the twain have in common, not dividing the one Son into two sons or two personalities, but designating what belonged to both. St Basil says: "He was wearied on the journey through tension, by the way, of flesh and nerves, not toiling along by any divine effort, but enduring in the body that whereunto the nature thereof was subject." And while here he asserts this so to be in conformity with the nature of the flesh, elsewhere he posits the selfsame things as predicable of the union with God the Word, in language as follows: "I speak of the Word as being buried in the flesh, and as being clothed upon, not thereby meaning the divine nature as such, but the union through the incarnation. Likewise his personal words and his personal sufferings, his sorrowing and troubles, I understand of the Word of God, but of the union through the incarnation, not of the natural (*scil.* essential) Deity."

And thus the holy Fathers, knowing well how to tread both those paths of orthodoxy to the mystery of the incarnation of the Word, made bold to speak words worthy of the natures, and withal most apt as regards the unity of the incarnation, thus: "He was hungered according to the flesh, he thirsted, he was wearied, he slept; neither thereby did he compromise his Deity, but rather manifested the nature of his flesh. Seeing that the Word from God the Father is a stranger to sorrow or death, he assumed unto himself flesh that he might be capable of suffering. At the same time, while joining to his Deity our own nature, so that the Only-Begotten Son of God does and accomplishes all things in accordance with the nature of our humanity, yet in the nature of his

Deity he can neither suffer nor want, but is the Fulfiller and the Perfecter of all creatures."

Thus then the ever-blessed Fathers spoke of the one Christ without distinctions, designing not to divide the one Christ into two persons or into two Sons (far be it from them!), but lending rather the greater strength to the faith by so refuting a certain group of heretics who in saying of the nature of Christ that it was "one," denied the true mystery of the Incarnation, viz.: The last Eutyches, who taught the infernal doctrine that the body of Christ was not consubstantial with that of the Virgin, and that he had one nature; the first Eutyches, who affirmed that the body of Christ was from heaven and unassumed, and that he had one nature; Valentinian and Mani, who asserted that the manifestation of Christ was in appearance only, and that he had one nature; Apollinaris, Sophronius and Julian, who taught that the Word took from the Virgin in part only, and not fully, our own nature, and that he had one nature; Eunomius and Arius, who said that the Word was joined to the flesh as an invisible creature, and that he had one nature.

I do suspect that thy saying "one nature" is not far from these views, though, to avoid any possible danger of ecclesiastical penalties, thou dost own the Word of God as incarnate, while at the same time denying Her from whom the flesh was derived. That is as if men who esteemed the royal throne as worthy of honor were to despise the material out of which it had been made a thing of beauty, and were to reject it as something mean, not even stopping to think that an object is valued only as it is compared with somewhat of the same kind. For if it were not compared with that from which it was derived, the excellency of the glory to which it had attained would remain obscure. And again, if the worth of the glory be not added to the self-same substance, this latter may not be said to have been glorified, but perchance changed only, for the glory and the glorifying are not one and the same thing, but two different things.

Now either come forward and confess that thou art one of the company of the aforementioned impious, and let us know thee for a veritable man-hater who denies the goodness of God (for he by assuming our own nature honored it, whereas by refusing

to confess this thou despisest it), and let there be an end of contention seeing that we are not of a class with thyself who takest pleasure in isolating thyself like a pagan from us, who have received a commandment not to walk in the way of the pagans, nor to enter the cities of the Samaritans; or else confess thyself with us innocent of being a worse shoot of the aforementioned evil roots, nay, with the Universal Church, confess the one and the same Christ, at the same time both God and Man, that thou mayest know what is the inseparable and the unconfused unity of the Word of God made flesh. Why be like unto water running down the hill which can never return, or hail that has left the clouds which is destined to melt away nor join the clouds again? Receive thou without insincerity the things that are written, and ascertain the truth of the Savior's works. Account the sense of thy discredited and erroneous thoughts for but a lie, and not as the divine letter which cannot lie. And perchance if thou stumble at the letter, thou still shalt believe through the works. For the Lord himself testifies that the proof of the word is in his works. "At least," saith he, "believe for the works' sake."

Compare not things totally different; for yonder, action is incorporeal and formal, while here, it is corporeal and material. He was fed in Abraham's dwelling, he also supped with the disciples, there in incorporeality, and here in corporeality, whence it is apparent that that was the semblance of the deed, while this is the deed itself. If thou compare this action with that, the phenomena are found to correspond, first and last. The birth, growth, death, burial, resurrection and ascension follow each other in due course, and after his own similitude, the Head invites to all of these experiences all those in the Church after him as his own true members. In thy opinion, however, all our expectations of hope are but shadows and phantoms. Verily, after many years, Mani and Marcion will arise to own in thee one of their number. "Thou," saith the Prophet, "destroyest all who speak lies." But if the word destroys, even more must the work bring destruction. "Was not," demands the great James, "Abraham our father justified by his works?" Wherefore then indulge in falsehood, rather than in faith of words and works, hankering to be a first-born son of Satan?

Pray why seekest thou to alter the subscription of the name or to replace it by that of another to whom the words are alien, or to garble these last as the author himself would not wish? Apply thy mind to the inner meaning of the word, and thou wilt not then wrest the word to thine own purpose. Bear witness of those words only that God the Word bears witness he has chosen, not justifying thine own to receive from the crowd either blame or praise. Discriminate thou which word is spoken of the nature, and which is employed to set forth the union. Thus wilt thou be able to apprehend with a clearer understanding the meaning of each several written word.

For much uncertainty and doubt attach to the evangelical and the apostolical language, until the benighted person look into it with the spirit's eye, when the very thing that otherwise might prove a cause for straying will be seen to be the very word of truth. But the foolish Apollinaris, learning from the Apostle that "forasmuch as the children are become sharers in blood and flesh, he himself also through kinship partook of the same," discounted from the body of Christ the human rational soul, saying, "He was divine through a spiritualized soul." In like manner another was misled and went astray through another word, to wit, when the Savior says, "No man hath ascended to heaven, except he that descended from heaven, even the Son of Man who is in heaven." Whence Eutyches conceived that first Christ brought down from heaven a body instinct with the divine nature, and then passed it through the Virgin as through a conduit, not perceiving that the words were spoken of a heavenly union that was from the earth. There are then in the divine writings words employed and to be understood of the nature, and still other words of the union through the incarnation. For when the Savior says to Philip, "He that hath seen me hath seen my Father," unless thou guide the eyes of thy mind to perceive that this seeing has reference to the natural (*scil.* substantial) appearance which the Son derives from the Father, thou not alone wilt introduce a confusion of Son with Father, but also wilt attribute to the Father, as to the Son, a body. So also when he said, "I and my Father are one," he meant not that the unity lay in personality and individuality, but in nature.

None of which, looking into it with a blinded mind, didst thou

know how to differentiate, but thou didst blame the Theology of the Ancients, by writing and saying: "What need to pay attention to the Greek masters who assert that the Trinity is divided into persons and individuals, and united by the Deity?" By which words thou makest it plain that thou receivest neither of those tenets, not dividing according to the persons being a Sabellian, and not uniting according to the nature, an Arian. But if there be no division according to the persons, how can the individuals remain distinct? As said Gregory the Great, Nazianzen, "The three existences are not to be made to conflict with the one co-existence, neither are they to be dissolved the one into the other, or to be confused." And again: "If thou do not unite by the Deity, thou wilt introduce alien natures and attribute a co-equal subsistence to things unequal." Thus hast thou sought to handle the truer light by means of the darkness, and invested with the blindness of thine own mind the holy Fathers whom thou art pleased to call "the Greek masters." And this thou hast well said, comparing others with thyself, for if thou thyself hadst been learned, thou wouldest not have called others learned. But if thou in truth acknowledgest them to be "masters," wherefore dost thou not receive those things that so wisely they teach? But who, I ask, might those Greek masters be? If thou wilt tell the truth! Wouldst thou lie besides? Thy very word of accusation against them shall indicate the identity of those teaching those things. Thou hast said that they divide by person and individuality, and unite by the Deity. What the holy Fathers did say is this: "Neither the individuality is taken away from the persons, nor are the personal attributes of one transferred to another." Again: "That the Deity is divided indivisibly, and united with distinctions, neither turning the unity into confusion, nor the division into divorce." Again: "That it is necessary to guard the unity of the Godhead, and to confess the Trinity of Persons, or three subsistences, each having its own properties." Again: "That the several names are not of things non-existent, nor do they all alike relate to the same person, as though our fortune were in names only and not in realities."

Behold these are the theological confessions of the blessed Fathers, for which thou pronouncest them heretics, neither fearing nor being horrified to wag thy tongue, poisoned like that of

a serpent, against them who were companions and servants of the Word of God, and, with an indomitable faith, laid the foundations of his Church. And what wonder that thou dost not stand in awe of those godly men, when thou shamelessly levellest words of blasphemy against the Supreme Being Himself, not confessing of the One Uncreated Substance, the Three Persons and the Three Subsistences, Father, Son and Holy Ghost! For if we take away the Cause by which they do and are said to belong to each other, we take away at the same time each several subsistence, wherefore God also becomes non-existent, and thou art left without a God, who art so bold in thy views of God as to philosophize saying, "The same person that was from the Father, that same also became a person in the Holy Virgin."

When in thy theology thou wast contemplating the Word as being with the Father, thou didst not deign to assign to him the attribute of personality; but now, fearing lest thou be compelled to confess the attribute of humanity derived from the Virgin, that is, from our human nature, thou callest him a person from the Father. But when thou sayest of him "self," why dost thou decline to say of him also "person"? Or hast thou forsooth in thy school been taught that the self is one thing, and the person another? Such is not the case; for although these two sometimes are differentiated, nevertheless when predicated of the same identical facts they mean the same identical thing. For we speak of an individual as a self and also as a person, reference being had to the corporeal and the incorporeal as the case may be. Now each individual of an (intelligent) species is called a person, as Paul, for example, being singled out of men, is called a person, while of incorporeal beings Gabriel, being singled out, is called a person. Likewise of the Uncreated Being, the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit, singly, is called a person. And the Persons, being singled out, are thus differentiated: The Father begets; the Son is begotten; the Spirit proceeds. This is what we term individuality, for whatsoever distinguishes a person, that is his individuality.

How now hast thou wandered away, either by not at all attributing personality or individuality to the Power in Three Persons, or, which were to commit the Libyan's (*sc.* Sabellius') suicide, by erroneously saying one person and individuality in-

stead of three persons and individualities! And I do greatly wonder withal at this new sort of method of thine, by which, whereas others have carried off some one or another spoil of the Devil's dark learning, thou, over-avaricious, hast not overlooked a single one, so that the Prophet's words do justly apply to thee, "Lift up thine eyes unto the truth and see, where in thy ways is there a single place wherein thou hast not sunk in the mire?" and what follows. Thou, I say, who art shameless toward all, who hast discarded confessions, orders, religion and all, pouring into their place the full content of thy blasphemy.

It were possible to count the pebbles of a river's bed, the sand of the sea, the drops of rain, but never the fresh-coined words and facts of thine own fancy. Thou hast thought to rise up against the Divine Word itself which saith, "The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord as many waters cover the sea." Indeed with thine alluring words thou hast made every day, and hour, and month, a sea of innovations. Whither shall we bear away the misfortunes thou hast caused us? To whom shall we tell the evils, to whom carry the sad word, O thou who art deprived of milk and weaned from the breast, who settest thy mouth in the heavens, and sweepst the earth with thy tongue, who puttest forth every effort to deprive us of the laws of our God and to teach us heresies instead; who, like a heated horse, wilt not halt in thy course, nor say, "Now will I rest myself!" and doest all this because thou art strong? Thou holdest fast to the term "one nature," whilst the true intent of thine employing it looks hard in the direction of the prattle of the Valentinians and the Manichaeans! As to saying, "of two natures," not alone canst thou not bear to hear it, but must apply to it an analogy of the vilest sort which, judging by thy theology should be rather a similitude of thyself! And fearing besides lest thou be compelled to say that the Savior's flesh was of our own human nature, thou robbest all of us creatures entirely of the name of "nature," saying, "There is no other nature to be posited, but the Creator's only, and all we who are derived from him have him only for our nature." To reduce the two to one, either thou must count the Creator with the creatures, which were Atheism, or must predicate deity of the creatures, which were Polytheism, but another form of Atheism. This is thy

boasted theology, rather the exhibition of thy folly, namely, to call this material world co-eternal with the Creative Power, to make it, that is, his nature instead of his possession.

But impudent and evil that thou art, thou knewest not, even as the Prophet saith, when thou hadst had enough of thine impiety. When thou art shown someone's comment on the sufferings of Christ, thou even makest bold to suppress the scriptures teaching them, saying, "Husbandmen sowing tares have sowed that." Which saying of thine not only is improbable, but is incredible. For when the evil husbandmen attempted to sow tares among the good seed, all ecclesiastics generally in duty bound shouldered the responsibility that was theirs, gathering together in one fold and shepherding the whole multitude of the flocks bereft of Christ, so that none could see the enemy and none hear. And supposing even that there were some, we will not say many, wild animals left among the flock, how could the shepherds, while repelling some that taught error, have delivered up to others like them their sheep to the subverting of the latter's true confession?

Or shall we say that those of our own people, whom the Holy Spirit raised to be illuminators after the Illuminator, I mean the companion saints, Isaac and Mashtotz (Mesrop), with all their elect servants and fellow-laborers, Eznik and the rest, and that other one who came after them but was not in time far from them, great among philosophers and renowned throughout the world, even Master Moses (Khorniensis), one and all both master translators and orthodox, shall we say these to such a degree were incompetent to recognize the foreign admixture? Are we to suppose that instead of unadulterated milk they caused their nationals to drink of turbid delights? Did they, think you, being hirelings and not shepherds, so neglect the sheep? Or was the word of God sounded forth to you, and did the gospel come to you alone? Are you, then, that Good Shepherd that Christ says he himself is, and were all those who came before you but thieves and robbers?

You say, "Seized by a thirst for piety and knowledge, they translated and brought to us whatsoever writings they could lay their hands upon." What mean ye by that? Being lovers of God, did they presume to do the works of haters of God? Beginning with a love for knowledge, did they end up with folly, calling

the bitter sweet and representing the darkness as light, aiming to exchange the good for the evil and to bring down the Prophet's woes upon their own heads?

Thus, to use the language of Job, do ye cover up vain thoughts with vain words, and, as says Isaiah, setting up for your hope a lie, take refuge under it, and by it are covered up. Thou hearest it read in the Gospels that Jesus hungered, whereupon thou plungest into a very current of wordiness, saying, "As it behooves God to be hungered, so do I apprehend that hunger, not after the fashion of men do I understand it as being, for man's hunger works corruption, and hunger itself is nothing but corruption."

But I for my part, in the first place, do not know of the divine in any way falling under the control of superior necessities, else the simple and incorporeal Power itself were corporeal. And, secondly, if we accept your view, we must needs give the lie to that which is written of his becoming man through a woman, for then he must of necessity have brought down from heaven his own body and manifested it unto us. Thus dost thou go on and meet once more that which thou art ever seeking, namely, Eutyches' fiction, even as a lost child, everywhere it goes, bawls out aloud for its own mother!

Besides, those things which to us are natural, whether of the spirit or of the body, are not corrupting to our nature, neither are they a corruption of it. For corruption is the negation of creation, and contraries cannot co-exist. But in man, hunger and thirst, toil and grief, cares and fear, and wrath, and unknowing, and the like, come all into being simultaneously with the rational mind. Wherefore those things are not corruption; if they were, they could not co-exist with true being. Rather they are constituting elements of true being. For He who brought us into being himself said to our first parent, "Of all the trees which are in the garden, eating thou shalt eat." In so saying he placed before one who was to be fed his needs according to his own nature. Else, it appears to me, He who planted the garden with all kinds of fruit, and placed man therein commanding him to enjoy it, did a meaningless thing!

But again he says, "Of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden thou shalt not eat, lest thou die." Had not the

instinct of fear been planted in man's rational soul, how could he have been properly warned to take heed to himself, or blamed for failing to take heed? Previously, too, it is written that he must cultivate the Garden of Delight which God has planted, and keep it. The first, the toil, and the second, the keeping, are bound up with a man as in a bundle. As to the habit of sleep, we learn the plain truth from the scripture which says, "God let fall upon Adam a stupor, and he slept." Not, understand, inducing the experience of sleep from without, but only permitting the man's natural bent to assert itself according to need. As to desire, I infer that from the man's coveting of the fruit from which he was excluded. Finally, from the saying, "There was found no helper for Adam," we are to infer the sadness of the first man, who saw other living beings, as was meet, dwelling together by two and two according to their kind, and was saddened by his own alone homeless desolation and loneliness. But as respects foreknowledge, he had by nature no foresight, but only by the influence of the divine Spirit, which sometimes moves, and at other times, withdrawing, leaves the mental rational spirit to itself. None of all existing creatures has been worthy to attain unto it. It belongs to the Creator alone, even as he himself, through Isaiah, says: "Besides me there is none else who knoweth the latter things before they come to pass, and so that they do, one and all, come to pass."

Whence it is clear that those things were according to nature before ever man had sinned, and not afterward introduced by sin into nature, as thou seemest to hold. But because the same self-determining will of the mind, upon the impact of desire, may incline either way, this is deemed to constitute a binary inclination, of which one term is denominated "of the Spirit," and the other "of sin." "The law," says Paul, "of the Spirit of life made me free from the law of sin and death," and, "I see another law armed against the law of my mind, and bringing me under bondage by the law of sin which is in my members."

It therefore is not the case that hunger, and sadness, and the rest, are later infusions of death and corruption, or that they themselves are corruption; but the mind has the choice, by taking them in hand as does the husbandman the seed, either to sow

them to the flesh and thereby reap corruption, or to the spirit, and from the spirit reap eternal life. Sadness itself is not death, but the sadness of this world worketh death, whereas that sadness which is according to godliness attains unto that salvation which is not to be repented of. And not only so, but the contraries of them also which do displace them, carry sometimes likewise with them life, and sometimes death. For sadness may be followed by gladness, and it was that gladness which accompanies wrongdoing and leads to mourning and sadness that the great James threatened to drive away in saying, "Your laughing shall be turned into mourning, and your gladness into sadness." But the same gladness, provided that the soul be enlarged with that love that is toward God, by Paul is exhorted to rejoice at all hours. Likewise eating from gluttony is condemned, but the table which is the perfecting of the divine glory in the same Apostle's words is praised. "Whether," he says, "ye eat, or drink, do all things to the glory of God."

From what has been said it is clear that we may affirm likewise of the first man that so long as he tried to keep the commandment, he would have kept away from himself both death and corruption, warring against them with his own natural powers, and so through perseverance attaining unto the ineffable life. But when through disobedience he slipped and fell, by which also he became the root of sin, then he came under the yoke of death and corruption. Thus not the Creator, nor yet that which by him had been created, but the freewill of the creature together with the deceit of the Traducer introduced into our nature both death and corruption. Only then this freewill was hard to move to sin, and easier to move to goodness, whereas now, fallen that we are into a corruptible life, we find ourselves contrariwise easily moved to sin, and with difficulty to virtue.

So much with reference to thy language, to set forth how we understand matters in our own. For thou definest our nature itself as corruption, by this meaning not alone those things that are bound up in the body, like toil, and hunger, and sleep, but also those three different parts of the spirit as well, namely, the cogitative, the amative and the choleric, which are nothing but natural powers of our human constitution, found in obedience to the com-

mandment armed against death and corruption, but in disobedience thereto throwing down the shield and surrendering to the enemy.

Now neither sin nor corruption, as I have shown, by right belonging to either our spiritual or our carnal passions, which last are but qualities and modes of our human existence, what wonder if the Savior also, when He lived among men, was subject to these same passions, wheresoever, and when, and to whatsoever extent he so willed, nor in any strange or shadowy way, but in very truth, and, having once assumed our nature, let the flesh carry its own burden? "For," says St Gregory of Nyssa, "having fasted forty days, he afterward hungered, when it pleased him permitting nature to do its own will."

Wherefore He was moved by our passions according to the laws of his flesh, which he had received from us, and not according to the divinity, as thou seemest to affirm. For had it been possible for Christ to bear the human in himself in terms of the Divine, then perhaps neither had he assumed flesh of our own very nature through the Virgin, but had retained the same phantasmal appearance that he manifested to the Patriarchs, in which also he dined in Abraham's dwelling, wrestled with Jacob, and, unknowing, asked questions of Adam and of Cain. But if these things were similitudes and types of the truth, whereas the Incarnation was no type at all but the truth itself, then it is patent that the Epiphany was true, He who appeared also was true, and likewise also was the passion, and his several sufferings. And though the divine power was well able to preserve the truth even in a similitude, yet, as one of the saints, none other than our own Gregory, has said, the first appearances and passions recorded, as compared with the last, must be accounted, not as the very truth itself, but as similitudes and types. For I call not the mere name but the thing itself the truth. So then just as his manifestation through a woman was real, just so were his actions and passions. And even as we have not known the flesh of the Word through another, but solely through the Virgin, that is, through the human lump, so I maintain Christ endured passions that were after our human fashion and our very own, not after the fashion of God or of any strange order of being. Even as says

Gregory the Great, Nazianzen: "He was twofold, seeing that he wearied, and feared, and wept, and hungered, and thirsted according to the laws of the flesh. To say that God the Word is twofold, we are taught by his flesh; and to say by the laws of the flesh, that is according to our humanity (as against his divinity), means that he endured its pangs." None of which canst thou admit, wherefore thou must affirm this human frame of ours itself to be sin.

On this subject Severianus, Bishop of Gabala, abounding in grace, in his Discourse on the Incarnation of the Savior, has said: "The impassible One suffered in that part of Him which was passible. He did not experience the passions that emerge in sin, but those that belong to our common nature. For the spirit and the flesh are subject to passions that lead to sin, and to other passions that are without sin. Hunger, for example, and thirst, weariness and sleep, are passions of the flesh not considered as being among the sins, while fornication and uncleanness and strife are sinful passions. Likewise the spirit is endowed with passions peculiar to its own nature received from the Creator, passions both useful and important, namely, fear, sadness and wrath. In themselves considered these are but passions that in proper measure and in their proper time may be a positive help to our nature." This says he, and adds: "The passions of the flesh and of the spirit, such of them as are without sin, the Giver of Life assumed. He hungered in the flesh, thirsted, wearied, slept, nor thereby did he gainsay his own Deity, but revealed rather the true nature of his flesh. Likewise in the spirit he feared, faltered, sorrowed. 'My soul,' he saith, 'is sorrowful even unto death'; and again we read, 'he began to be sorrowful and troubled.' And those were not the passions of sin, but marks rather of the nature of the flesh." And again he says: "That he might stop in advance the mouths of heretics, and might make it manifest that he, in truth, assumed this flesh of ours, he came under manifold needs, dreaded sufferings, trembled before the power of death, and was troubled and saddened in the presence of life's term."

Behold this holy Father showed in plain words that the passions which reside in us are not elements of sin and corruption, but experiences of the natural flesh and spirit, to which our Lord

submitted himself, voluntarily and in conformity to the design of the divine foreknowledge, and not because they had any power forcibly to seize the Savior's body, seeing that it belongs to man alone to be so enslaved by his natural passions. God the Word indissolubly united with himself our own nature; whensoever he so willed he signified to his flesh to bring the natural to the fore, thus proving the true union with himself of the entire soul and body of man. So also thinks the wonderful John, of Constantinople, asking, "And how came he to hunger in the morning?" and answering, "Whensoever he so willed, he felt his passions, releasing the flesh thereto."

But, they say, if that be so, then Christ was in an unstable equilibrium; at times, upon leave of the Word, his flesh weakened, while at other times it grew strong, partaking of the character of the Word. Again they err in the faith, presumptuously wresting the truth. What then wilt thou say of the dying of Christ for us? If the matter stands as thou sayest, then either he died and was changed, or was not changed and did not die; or again if he did die and suffered no change, he took his passions also in the same way, enduring no change in his passions. No! but as in his death he endured our death, the breath leaving the body, just so also in his passions did he parallel our passions. As says St Basil in his Discourse of Thanksgiving: "Now the Lord accepted hunger who breathed forth the food that perisheth not; and he manifested his thirst from the consumption of moisture in the body; and likewise he wearied, the flesh and nerves being on a tension from the journey, the flesh, I say, not the deity, being worn by labor. He endured whatsoever experience was most in keeping with nature. He also shed tears. Whatsoever experience of the flesh was natural, he permitted." So writes this holy Father.

Whence it is evident that by the operation of his self-determining will, and whensoever he so desired, he in very fact permitted the natural to affect by its own powers, but without corruption, his flesh and his spirit. Not the name and form alone, but the reality itself to which the name belonged, was thus affected, and it is for this reason that he is said to have taken our passions. And this (my language should not greatly scandalize thee), always bearing in mind the true nature of corruption. For I do maintain

that it was natural forces that seized upon Christ, whereas thou wouldst introduce unnatural, to wit, corruption and chance. He was not a mere man, but neither was he Deity unclothed; rather he was at one and the same time both God and Man, the Lord displaying in himself some things like unto ours, and yet other things unlike. He hungered like unto ourselves, yet again because he hungered, but not after our manner, he could render us capable of being satisfied with the heavenly righteousness. As a mere man he would have been powerless to operate upon his own passions; and as God alone he could not by any operation have become conscious of any passions. But now he being in both ways operant, we on our part have become, through his assuming our own manner of weakness, partakers of his manner of power.

He assumed our ignorance, and thereby bestowed upon us the gift of prophecy. He died after our own manner, giving up his body to the burial, and in his human spirit joined verily the company of those in hades, wherefore by the one act we were bestowed the dissolution of death, and by the other the disruption of corruption. And we may say in general that he became partaker of our nature that we might be made partakers of his. This affirms also the most illuminating and great Athanasius of Alexandria: "The Word submitted to generation in the flesh, and gathered thus to himself in a new image his own creation wasted by sin, corruption and death, whereby also he effected the judgment of sin on the earth, and the removing of the curse upon the tree, and the disruption of corruption in the grave, and the dissolution of death in hades. He went everywhere, displaying in himself the image of our own form, that he might work out salvation for every man. For what need could there have been for God to be born of a woman, and to grow in stature and in years, who had made the eternities, what need of the Cross, and the grave, and hades, into which we ourselves had fallen, but that he designed, by vivifying us in our image, to call us to a union with and a likeness to his own perfect image?"

In saying this the godly Father signified, not that God the Word by his mighty power or his authoritative command destroyed our destroyers, namely, our sin, and corruption, and death, but that in his own flesh, which was from ourselves, and in his rational

spirit, he touched and conquered them. And in this way the Second Adam became the renewer of the first; for even as the first Adam, wounded by sin, surrendered himself to serve Satan, so conversely the Second Adam, coming in innocency, condemned sin, and bringing healing to the wounded, urged the enslaved to enslave the enslaver. And this deliverance of ours we have found from the Lord not any otherwise than through his passion as a servant, which he accomplished in his body, being thus obedient to the Father unto death, whereby he manifested his power in weakness, and through his humiliation opened up a way for our exaltation. Thus also amplifies the great Gregory Nazianzen: "He embodies (says he) in himself all that is another's, displaying in himself both me and mine. In himself he will waste wickedness even as the flame the candle, and the sun the fog, and myself, because of the union, shall become a partaker of those things that are his. Wherefore he honors obedience in action, and the sharing of his experience in suffering. For he deems not love alone sufficient, as it is not to us, but we must needs make it perfect by works, even as works of his are the proof of his love. Perhaps it were no mistake to think also that he tests our obedience, as he measures everything else, by his own sufferings, that is, by his own art of loving men, as if he must needs view all that is ours through that which is his own." And those are his words.

But thou art not to put all human passions as it were on one string, or count them as one, deeming them all as being characterized in us alike. They have not all, I say, the same significance in the economy of salvation. For some of them are what we call natural, being implanted in us by nature, such as hunger, and thirst, and sleep, and toil, sadness and fear, anger and ignorance. Others again came in afterward, one originating in ourselves, namely, sin, which taught us to despise the commandment, and another was added by the Creator by way of a penalty for sin, namely, death. As to corruption, this is a consequence of death, being introduced into our nature neither by ourselves nor by the Creator, yet preying and feeding upon them that are fallen under death. For as I have before said, it is the enemy of existence, corrupting matter and seeking to reduce as it were that which is to that which is not. Wherefore the Liar, and Deceiver of our first

parent, the more rejoiced and amused himself in his evil design that he thought to have completely defeated his rival, and having prevailed to destroy him who of all creation was called the Image of God (which image, he was convinced, being once dissolved would be impossible of reconstituting in the substance of which he first was made), tyrannically clung to the living breath, paying no more heed to breathless and motionless matter. But the Word of God, who had come to give us life, permitted not corruption to come nigh to his own flesh, seeing that it was his set purpose by his own death to dissolve it. It was as if one were to remove the foundation from under a building, or effect the overthrow of a city by the demolition of its walls. For though he who judged righteously punished us with death, yet in the same death did he imbed two several sorts of goodly seeds, forasmuch as death, though itself a penalty, both makes an end of sin, and marks the beginning of that life which is incorruptible. Therefore our Lord gladly came down and submitted to it, calling us by his resurrection to the life above, designing at once to destroy sin and to end the robbery of corruption.

This subject of corruption I would pursue yet a step further. For it were meet to hold up with a multitude of words to public opprobrium this exceedingly wicked race of ours, to the end that the wisest may know with what honor our nature was created of God in the beginning, and into what sort and multitude of dishonors it since has fallen, stumbling by its own self-will, and how the Creator took thought to become Man for our salvation, saving us by the blood of his Cross both from death and corruption, and from bondage to the Traducer's tyranny. Observe that corruption is the cause of all dissolution, being superinduced by change. For a whole consists of parts, and corruption, by introducing change, dissolves that which consists of parts. For instance: Imagine a plant plucked up by the gardener, and overtaken by corruption. This last, by an initial command of change, releases from the plant its natural properties, and in their place introduces the most unsightly conditions, not permitting it to remain in its altered state, but, dragging it down and resolving it into its several constituting elements, so that none but the Almighty Hand alone again can assemble the scattered materials and recreate a specimen.

Now our reason shows that there are three several points at which we suffer overthrow. The first, when we ourselves find sin and make it our own; the second, when God, by way of a judgment upon us, pronounces on us the death penalty; the last, when in consequence of death corruption overtakes, and especially as Satan finds in this the triumph of his deceit. For when the Creator said to him who was earthborn, "Dust thou art, and to dust shalt thou return," it was not by way of a command, but rather by way of a declaration of his destiny after death, as when, a stone rolling down from a height, a man standing by might say to it, Thou shalt go whither it is proper that thou shalt go.

Now the two terminals are known as being plainly evil in both name and reality, whilst the middle term is neither plainly nor in the same manner evil, but receives its character from the others with which it is bound up. For that which is designated as death, is also designated as sleep, that which is the end of life being also the beginning of life. But man and the Traducer together invented the first and the last, man becoming the agent of sin, and the Traducer of the corruption of our nature. But He who for us became Man, and was called the Second Adam, committed no sin at all. "For there was no guile found in his mouth, neither did his flesh see corruption." That which he had not himself put into our nature, neither did he touch, deeming it superfluous and vain to appropriate those very things from which he designed to deliver us. But from the penalty, he did not hold back, as when a physician, to inspire confidence in the administering it, himself tastes of the medicine intended for the sick. For the penalty, being neither sin nor corruption, is a somewhat that dissolves and destroys both the others out of our nature, as fire destroys the alloy out of gold. And the bearing of that voluntarily is in the power of Christ alone, and of them after him who are empowered and made worthy to receive the glory of adoption. As saith the Apostle: "Being sharers with him of his sufferings, they become sharers also with him of his glory." "For whom the Lord loveth he reproveth, and chasteneth every son whom he receiveth." And this, though "for the time being it seem not unto joy, yet afterward yieldeth peaceable fruit unto righteousness to them who are exercised thereby."

As for the fruit of peace, that, I say, is He himself, "who made

of the twain one, breaking down the wall of partition, that is, the enmity, in his body." And what peace could be loftier or more supra-mundane than this, that unites human nature with the divine and makes them one through the victory of that Higher? And this is just what, as it seems to me, the Son means in saying to the Father, "Glorify thy Son with the glory which is from thee, which I had from thee before the world was." The underlying meaning of those words the Lord himself now will come and teach us, if we will ask him.

—Thou, Lord, callest God thy Father, wherefore thou art the Son of his very being, clearly sharing with him his glory; what then is that thou sayest, "Glorify thy Son with thine own glory"? Thou sayest that thou hadst glory, and that thou hadst it from Him, and hadst it before the world was. But if thou hadst the glory that is of him from the beginning of the world, then what is it that thou now askest for? Is it somewhat that thou then hadst and dost not now have? But it were impossible that thine eternal being should ever have been without glory. For if the glory be not thine, then neither is the being; and if thou hadst them not, then by the Father from whom thou hadst received them were they taken away from thee. Whatsoever thou hast learned of him reveal unto us, Lord, we beseech thee, for in thee are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

—I was about to suffer reproaches, to receive the spitting, and the smiting on the cheek, to taste the vinegar and the gall, to endure the death of the Cross; I besought the Father to restore his glory unto me as one despised.

—And how could that be? Was it the case that thou by thy reproaches wast despoiled of thy glory? If so, then in thy death thou didst lose thine immortality, and we might say that thy deity also deserted thee because of the flesh.

—Not so; I suffered no change in my person, but the opinions of men, which they held respecting me, these did change. When in their healing they beheld miracles, they wondered, believed, praised, according to the glory that in truth was mine; but when they saw me despised, they were offended in me, and, forsaking thoughts befitting my person, they sank into such as were most unworthy of me, even as Isaiah had prophesied they would.

Hence do I entreat the Father to remove from the opinions of men the contempt of their unbelief, and to clothe them with the glory of thoughts of faith. Let them not look upon this that they now behold, but upon that which through this is yet to be, even the greatness of mine eternal glory. Let them whose wisdom hath led them into error know of a surety that it behooves "the faithful to live by the foolishness of preaching," that men must needs find their lost glory through my reproaches, inherit immortality through that death which I taste, and withal confess that through my becoming the Son of Man, the sons of men shall be made worthy to become the sons of God. The Father also hath answered me from heaven to the same intent: "I have glorified, and will glorify yet again."

—As before thy death, Lord, through the power of thy miracles, some men were saved, even more since thy voluntary death may those believing on thee be abundantly multiplied; for the elect through the sign of thy divine miracles are a small number to the innumerable host that the Word of the Cross shall gather from all mankind to be inheritors of thy Kingdom.

APPENDIX III

CHARTER OF CHRISTIANS IN PERSIA

GIRAGOS VARTABED, an Armenian writer of the second half of the thirteenth century, states that the Catholicos, John of Otzun, at the close of his audience of the Arab Caliph (whom he identifies with Hisham), made and was granted for his people a threefold petition, viz., for (1) freedom of private conscience, (2) freedom of public worship, and (3) freedom of churches and clergy from taxation. The granting, or rather the confirming, of these rights by Omar II, or by Hisham, may very well be historical. The Caliph Omar II (717-20), the Caliph Hisham (724-43), the Catholicos John of Otzun (717-28), and the authenticator of the ensuing document, the Imam Mohammed Jafar (711-36), were all contemporaries.

A tradition is repeated also by Giragos to the effect that the Prophet of Islam granted the Armenians freedom to hold the Christian faith on the condition of a tribute from each household of "four dirhems of money, three measures of wheat, a saddle-bag, a rope of hair, and a towel." On this it may be remarked that it was not an uncommon thing for Mohammed to enter into correspondence with nations and rulers with whom he had not as yet come into close quarters. The present document, preserved in the archives of the Armenian Bishop of New Julfa, rendered here from the version of Johanianz (New Julfa, 1881), reproduces a charter, purporting to be (though by modern criticism pronounced a forgery) originally granted by Mohammed (625 A.D.) to the Monastery of St Catherine, at Mount Sinai, and intended by the Prophet to be valid for Christians everywhere. Jafar, sixth Shiite Imam (eighth century), testifies to its authenticity after comparing the text with the original in his own hand. The Shah of Persia in the seventeenth century gives this document in copy to the Armenian Bishop of New Julfa to define his people's rights and obligations under Persian rule. The instrument serves to convey an idea of the conditions on which, in theory, Christian minorities have been tolerated in the Moslem East. It is only fair to add that

a charter of this sort was frequently observed in the infraction of it by the ruling element, and the more as it was easy at any time to make a false step by a few Christians, or even by one, the pretext for the cruelest wholesale reprisals.



By the will of God! In the name of God Merciful!

Be this Writ known to all in the handwriting, and the style, a Compact firm, a Treaty that must be obeyed by all Christian nations, such as dwell throughout the world toward the eastward of Arabia and Persia, or within the bounds of them, whether they be in immediate contact with the Faithful or whether they be distant, and whether or no they have acquaintanceship with the Faithful. This Covenant and Compact is worthy of obedience, and it behooves all Moslems also to observe its provisions. Whosoever shall esteem it his bounden duty to obey the words of this Covenant, his faith is perfect after the manner of men who do well, and such an one shall be esteemed worthy of a reward; but those who shall wilfully pervert the words of this Covenant, annul it or do despite to it, or shall disobey the commands of this Compact, persisting in their contrary way, such shall be deemed nullifiers of the Covenant and Compact of God. Whosoever also shall irreverently despise this Writ, the same shall be held worthy of punishment, whether he be a king, or one of the people, whether he be a pious believer (*sc.*, a Moslem), or only a believer (*sc.*, a Christian).

Now to begin the words of this Compact, in accordance with the prompting of God vouchsafed to me in authentication. With a firm bond do I bind this Compact, the like of which no prophets of the past ever have bound, and as no angels standing before God have found it easy to command. The words therefore of this Covenant which I am about to lay down must be obeyed by all who are my people.

All pious believers shall deem it their bounden duty to defend believers and to aid them wheresoever they may be, whether far or near, and throughout Christendom shall protect the places where they conduct worship, and those where their monks and

priests dwell. Everywhere, in mountains, on the plains, in towns and in waste places, in deserts, and wheresoever they may be, that people shall be protected, both in their faith and in their property, both in the West and in the East, both on sea and land.

And even as they honor and respect Me, so shall Moslems care for that people as being under our protection, and whensoever any distress or discomfort shall overtake them, Moslems shall hold themselves in duty bound to aid and care for them, for they are a people subject to my Nation, obedient to their word, whose helpers also they are.

It therefore is proper for My sake to attend to their comfort, protection and aid, in face of all opposition and distress, suppressing everything that becomes a means to their spoliation. In the levying of taxes, it is necessary not to exact more than they are able to pay, but to adjust matters with their consent, without force or violence. Their building enterprises shall not be interfered with; their priests shall not be molested in the performance of their task; they shall not be persecuted for their faith or their customs, but shall be allowed to pray as they will in their own places of worship and according to their own rites; neither shall their churches be dismantled or destroyed, or their homes and mansions confiscated by Moslems, for mosques or residences, without their consent. Whosoever shall not do as is here prescribed, but shall do contrary to my behests, the same shall be held a despiser of this Compact, and a gainsayer of the word of God and of his Prophet.

No land taxes shall be exacted from them in excess of the value of Four Dinars (\$10.00), or one linen sheet, which shall be applied for the benefit of the Moslems and held as a sacred trust for public use. Nothing more also shall be exacted from them (*scil.*, by way of a poll tax) than what we here prescribe. Whether they be merchants and wealthy, or whether they live in the open country, whether they fish for pearls in the sea, or own mines of precious stones, or of gold, or of silver, or possess other rich estates, they shall not be made to pay more than Twelve Dirhems (\$1.50).

Of those who are not of the Christian faith, neither conduct worship according to the Christian rite, Four Dirhems (\$.50)

shall be exacted. But of those who conform to that people and are obedient to their word, not more shall be demanded than the aforementioned Twelve Dirhems, provided that they dwell where all their people are resident. Those who travel, and being without a place of permanent abode are constantly on the move, shall not be subject to land taxes, except that in the event any of them shall fall heirs to property on which the Imam has a legal claim, the lawful tax shall be exacted, yet even so the taxpayer shall not be made the victim of violence or of unlawful exactions in excess of his ability to pay. His mansions, his produce, and his fruits shall not be made the objects of avarice.

Christians shall not be asked to fight for Moslems against the enemies of the Faith, neither shall Moslems at war with foreign nations or engaged in massacre constrain Christians to make common cause with them against the enemy. But if the enemy shall attack the Christians, then the Moslems shall not spare the use against him of their horses, their swords and their spears. In so doing they will perform a pleasant deed.

No Christians shall be brought by force to confess Islam, and no disputes except over the better things shall be engaged in with them. Moslems shall extend over the Christians everywhere the arm of mercy and kindness, protecting them from the exactions of oppressors. If any Christian shall be found inadvertently offending, Moslems shall deem it their duty to assist him, accompanying him to the law-courts, so that not more may be exacted of him than is prescribed by God, and peace may be restored between the parties to the dispute according to the Scripture.

All conditions previously named being observed, and the capitation tax being by them paid, no Christians shall be tyrannized over or oppressed by my people. Neither shall they on their part tyrannize over Moslems or oppress them, from this time forth even until such time as God shall ordain. Moslems shall not take the women and maidens of the Christians by force, but only with the consent of their lords, except in the event that they by free choice shall desire to be united to Moslems and married to them whether permanently or only for a time, when this shall be permitted to them out of respect to the freewill of women who should be at liberty to marry whom they love and choose. And if any

Christian woman shall marry a Moslem, it shall be permitted to her to continue in the Christian faith, attending the churches of the Christians without let or hindrance, and she shall live at her pleasure according to her own faith and laws. No obstacle shall be placed in the way of her communicating with her own spiritual advisers, neither shall she, forcibly and against her will, be made to forsake her own faith and laws. Whosoever shall do despite the words of this Contract, the same shall be accounted as having done despite God, and shall be held guilty in the Prophet's sight of annulling the words of the Covenant of the Prophet of God. Such an one shall be numbered among sinners before God.

Christians must attend to all repairs on their own churches, chapels and monasteries. If in the interest of the benevolent Moslem public, and of their faith, Moslems shall ask of the Christians for assistance, the latter shall not deny them what help, as an expression of friendship and goodwill, they are able to render. Seeing that the Christians have submitted to us, implored our protection and taken refuge with us, we deem all help and succor rendered to them every way legitimate. If any one of them shall be sent as an envoy to negotiate peace between Moslems and Infidels, no one shall prevent his going, and if he should prove of service to our cause, let the service be accepted; but whosoever shall despise him, the same shall be numbered among the wicked, guilty before the Prophet of God, and an enemy of his revealed word.

Here also follows a Treaty of Mohammed, the Great Prophet of God (may the blessing of God rest upon him and upon his posterity!), with the Christian people, a Treaty which His Majesty after the foregoing words commanded and established with the Christians relative to their faith and laws, embracing a few commandments by which Christians shall regard themselves as being bound. Let them do nothing contrary to the previous words, and everything in harmony with those following.

One of the commandments is this, that they shall give no aid to infidels, whether openly or surreptitiously, neither receive into their houses enemies of Moslems lest at a convenient opportunity they attack them. They shall not permit enemy men to stop at their houses or churches, neither shall they harbor enemy troops,

or aid them with spear, arrow, sword or horse, or with aught else.

They shall not act as guides to them, or show them how to ambush the enemy. They shall not commit to them their possessions for safe-keeping; they shall not communicate with them, or aid them by word or deed, or afford them shelter except only under duress.

If a Moslem shall chance at a Christian's house, he may there be entertained three days and three nights; more than that is unnecessary. Christians shall avert from Moslems the abuse and oppressions of tyrants.

In the event that it becomes necessary for them to hide a Moslem in their own mansions or houses, they shall give him a place to live, and take care of him, neither forsaking him, nor leaving him without food, so long as he shall be in hiding. Women and children of Moslems shall not be betrayed or shown to the enemy, neither shall Christians deviate from these orders.

And if any Christian shall do contrary to this Treaty, or ignore it, he shall be accounted as annulling the same. Such an one is loathsome to God, and the Prophet shall visit upon him his just retribution.

Wherefore let all Christians deem it both binding and proper to observe the words of this Treaty even until such time as God shall ordain.

In witness whereof is attached the Signature that in the presence of the Clergy and the Lords of the Nation, the Holy, Great Prophet, Mohammed, affixed, confirming the foregoing Treaty. God Omnipotent and Lord of All!

In pursuance of the Command of the Great Prophet of God, Mohammed, the Lord's Chosen (may the blessing of God rest upon him and upon his posterity!), this Treaty was drawn up on the Monday following the first four months of the Fourth Year of the Hegira.

APPENDIX IV

A ROLL OF MODERN MARTYRS

SEVERAL martyrs of the faith at different times have been mentioned in the course of this History. Time has kept no record by name of that innumerable host of witnesses who in different ages since the rise of Islam, even down to the late Turkish deportations, at the price of their lives refused to assimilate to the Moslem mass about them. Some of them were burned wholesale to death in their churches where they had taken refuge, others were slain unseen by friendly eyes in lonely valleys, and others still left their bones bleaching the burning deserts of Arabia. Of their names, a few we know; the vast majority will go down to history as that multitude of witnesses that are the Armenian people. Nor will history forget the names of the dozen American missionaries who in one way or another in recent years laid down their lives on the altar of Armenia's sacrifice. There are other martyrs of Armenia whose lives do not enter the general current of history, who yet by their outstanding character deserve to be mentioned as representative martyrs of the Church, not the less so that they fall in ordinary times, or belong to the ordinary walks of life. A few only can here be mentioned.



Yusuf, of Tabriz

Yusuf (Joseph), the Persian, born and bred in Islam. Once delighted in tormenting and persecuting Christians. But of a sudden he was overwhelmed by the enormity of his own misdeeds, and for three days and nights in torture of conscience cried out, "O God, I have sinned against thee!" Upon quieting down at last he told those about him of the torments of hell he had witnessed in dreams of the night as being reserved for him. He went to see the Armenian Vartabed, Stephen Lalug, in Tabriz, and received baptism at his hand, when his name was changed to Isaac. After that he began to preach in Tabriz, Kurdistan, Persia, Armenia, Georgia, Syria, Mesopotamia and elsewhere, continuing in the work for

the space of forty years. Everywhere his former co-religionists persecuted him. Beaten with rods at Tabriz, cast into fire at Lailashi (Caucasus), cast down from the city walls at Nakhichevan, hung up by the feet at Maragha and stoned at Arjesh, he at last was brained at Schamakhi, in 1417, and so received the martyr's crown.

Mirac, of Tabriz

Was the community head of the Armenians of the Persian capital, esteemed at the court of Shah Yaghoub, a man of great wealth with many beneficences to his credit, having built churches, purchased security for Christians, and redeemed multitudes of war captives. A Mahdi, also influential at court, and granted by the Shah all sorts of license, sought how he might get Mirac out of the way. One day point-blank he proposed to him apostasy, and being thwarted accused Mirac of blasphemy against Islam, slew him on the spot, and took his head as a trophy to the royal palace. The Moslem rabble thereupon made a rush for the church in the city Mirac had built, to destroy it. The Armenians appealed to the Shah for protection. Yaghoub ordered the mob dispersed, and after due process had the Mahdi slain and his body thrown out. Upon this the Great Judge Kasim took it upon himself to give the Mahdi an honorable burial. Yaghoub ordered the Judge himself together with his henchmen put to death. Shortly thereafter Yaghoub himself was found dead of poisoning. Date, 1486.

Barunak, of Amida

Was the son of a sun-worshipping father, and a Christian mother, daughter of a priest. Attended the Armenian Church of his home city, Diarbekir, and studied the faith under a monk by the name of Megrditch. Became specially interested in Hagiology, and was fired with a zeal to preach the faith if need were unto martyrdom. Familiar with Turkish, Arabic and Persian, he engaged Moslems of those nationalities in private conversation, bringing over ninety to a knowledge of Christ, we are to understand secretly. Though having a family and large business interests, he gave himself up for three whole years almost entirely to evangelism, when at last he was detected and brought before

a Sheik as a deserter from Islam. Denying the charge, he was taken first before the Judge, then before the Governor, and finally after cruel tortures, with a dog tied to his neck, nailed by hands and feet to a post, and applied the torch. The year was 1524.

Harutun, of Tiflis

Son of an Armenian of Aleppo, and a woman of Havlapar village, suburb of Tiflis. He was born about 1712. He was a gifted poet and minstrel, and is best known by his nom-de-plume, Saiat Nova. A love poem from his pen will be found in the English in Blackwell's collection of Armenian Poems. He sang in Turkish and Georgian, as well as in his own native Armenian, and from 1742 onward was sought at the Georgian Court as well as among the populace. In 1768, upon losing his wife Marmar by death, he left his four children with relatives at Tiflis and retired to the Monastery of the Holy Cross of Haghpad, taking the cowl to do penance, as he thought, for the sin of his minstrel days. During a Persian incursion into Georgia, he hastened to Tiflis to remove his children now grown to Mozdok on the Terek, returning immediately thereafter to his monastery on the Kur, when the Persians raided the establishment and broke into the conventual chapel as Saiat Nova stood at prayer. They constrained him to come out and apostatize. "I will," he replied, "neither leave this church, nor deny my Jesus." Whereupon he was cut down by the swords of the soldiery (1795).

Barbara, of Erzurum

Daughter of Ambar Zurician, of suburban Erzurum. Having at the age of eleven years been promised to a youth of a nearby village, she was now fourteen and about to be married. A Moslem young man casting covetous eyes upon her, resorted to the headman of her village, also a Moslem, complaining that long since she had promised to turn Moslem and marry him. Barbara was taken before the court of the Governor of Erzurum, Bahram Pasha, turned over to a hodja for instruction in the Moslem faith, and, unconvinced, was subjected to torture, being alternately hung by her hair in ice-cold water, and applied hot irons, until the hodja's own family began to protest. Gentler means of per-

suasion also failing, the Governor then ordered that Barbara might marry the Moslem youth without renouncing her own faith. This also she refused, all threats notwithstanding, and resorted to flight. A brother, Caspar, finding her in hiding, brought her to a friendly woman, Mariam by name, who kept her in concealment in the city. Meantime Bahram Pasha being succeeded in office by Ibrahim Pasha, the latter now took cognizance of the case. Several people of the girl's village were cast into jail and tortured to reveal her whereabouts, among them her brother, who was offered apostasy, and in default of this hanged at the church door. Soon Barbara and Mariam were found and brought before the Governor. Again imprisonments and commitments to hodjas. The two women finally were condemned to hang within the parish church, their bodies to be exposed for three days, a verdict that upon protest of the Bishop and city headmen was commuted to hanging at the church door. The three martyrs sleep in the Armenian cemetery of Erzurum, their graves until our own day a pilgrim resort for Armenians of that region. Date, 1810.

Joachim, of Constantinople

Joachim, an unlettered youth of the Psamatia quarter of the Turkish capital, in 1839 had professed Islam to get out of a difficulty. Afterward he returned to his own faith, disguising himself in western clothes. He was detected in 1843, and placed under arrest. Allurements and tortures alike proved powerless to make him change his mind. The Patriarch and the magnates equally were helpless to intercede for him, as Moslem law in such cases was inexorable. The interest of the British Ambassador, Sir Stratford Canning, was enlisted, but he, too was hoodwinked. For while the Grand Vizier, Reouf Pasha, made him fair promises, he issued, under pressure of the Sheikh-ul-Islam and other ministers of state, the youth's death-warrant. On the 29th of August, 1843, at the Fish Bazaar, the young man was beheaded on the charge of apostasy from Islam, the headless body being left for several days exposed to the public gaze. A joint protest of all the foreign Ambassadors followed in January, whereupon a state council being held, the opinions of the Sheikh-ul-Islam and doctors of the Moslem Law were placed on record as being for religious

toleration, though a seven-year term was asked to prepare the minds of the people for the new order. This resolution was communicated to the Ambassadors on the 4th day of March, 1844, and on the 23rd day of the same month the Sultan himself gave Sir Stratford the following personal assurance: "Henceforward neither shall Christianity be insulted in my dominions, nor shall Christians be in any way persecuted for their religion." Joachim became thus the last victim of a barbarous law which through the centuries took a good many lives.

Keoshker, of Geben

Moslem fanaticism did not have to wait for a so-called "apostasy" to wreak vengeance upon Christians. A charge of sedition and a special order from the Caliph always were sufficient to give free course to the popular blood-lust. The following (quoted verbatim from the *Missionary Herald* for March, 1911, p. 127) is but one account out of many of atrocities perpetrated by the Turks during and preceding the First World War:

Mrs. Keoshker, of Geben (Cilicia), in the massacres of 1895 lost her husband, father, mother, brothers, sisters, and other near relatives to the number of fifty-nine. This was in Marash; later she married again and went to Geben, one of our outstations; here she and her husband built up a happy home. The husband was an earnest Christian. When the Adana massacre broke out in 1909 he was away in a Turkish village in the Adana province. The Turks seized him and told him he must deny Christ or be killed. On his refusal, they cut off his feet, then his hands; next his legs at the knees and his arms at the elbows; after that, the rest of his legs, and finally his head. To his very last breath he consistently confessed his Savior. He was as true a martyr as any church history records. This story comes from trustworthy eyewitnesses. The two older children are now in an orphanage.

NOTES

1(p. 2). Frazer (J.G.): The belief in immortality and the worship of the dead. London, 1924, pp 256 f.

2(p. 2). Tyler (J.): Forty years among the Zulus. Boston, 1891, p 63. Cf Callaway: The religious system of the Amazulu. London, 1884, pp 1-104. The reader may also consult two contributions by the present writer in *The Expository Times*, Edinburgh, October, 1906, pp 46 f., and March, 1911, p 282, together with replies elicited by the first, June, 1908, pp 428 f., and October, 1908, p 45.

3(p. 3). Barton (G.A.): Archaeology and the Bible. Philadelphia, 1933, p 311. Compare Wardle (W.L.): Israel and Babylon. London, 1925, p 173, "Before the holy house of the gods had been made, before reeds and trees, bricks and buildings, cities, creatures, the famous shrines, had come into existence, Marduk laid a reed on the face of the waters, created earth and poured it out beside the reed. That he might cause the gods to dwell in the habitation of their hearts' desire he created mankind. The goddess Aruru together with him created the seed of mankind. He created the cattle of the field, Tigris and Euphrates, grass, reeds, herbs, lands, marshes, swamps, animals, gardens, woods, cities, buildings." There is a "reed hut" in the Deluge Story of the Gilgamesh Epic. "The 'reed hut,' " says this writer (op. cit., p 214), "has been a great puzzle. Both the word and the general sense are difficult. Dhorme translates it 'reed-hedge.' "

4(p. 3). Casalis (E.): The Basutos. London, 1861, pp 240 f.

5(p. 6). "For in Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor, an intellectual life was pulsing to which there was no parallel in the Western world at the beginning of the Roman Empire. Science, literature, industry were in this era the province of Orientals, not of Greeks or Romans." Kennedy (H.A.A.): St. Paul and the mystery religions. London, 1913, p 20.

6(p. 7). The Armenian *narod* is reminiscent of the Parsee *naojote*, or initiation service. See Modi (J.J.): The religious ceremonies and customs of the Parsees. Bombay, 1937, pp 169-86. The sacred thread is used in Parsee and in Brahman initiation ritual in India. "Three white cotton threads, by their color symbolizing purity, are tied together in one place by a sacred knot, and after being blessed and sprinkled with holy water, are placed round the boy's body. This investiture makes him a Brahman; he is now 'twice-born,' or regenerate. Before this act he could take no part in any religious ceremony, nor could he read the Vedas. It is thus obviously the beginning of his spiritual life as a Brahman." MacCulloch (J.A.): Comparative Theology. London, 1902, pp 243 f. See also Williams (Monier): Religious thought and life in India. London, 1883, Part I, pp 358-78.

7(p. 8). Cumont (Fr.): The mysteries of Mithra. Chicago, 1903, pp 125 f.

8(p. 9). Conybeare (F.C.): The Key of Truth. Oxford, 1898, pp xc ff.

9(p. 12). Ibid., pp clii ff.

10(p. 30). The Hoursbook (Horologion) will be recognized as the book of services of the seven daily canonical hours, and the Calendar Book, as that of the Church Calendar, with its Holidays and Saints' Days. The Missal, called in the Eastern Churches *The Liturgy*, is the service of the Communion. Like others of its class the Armenian Liturgy descends from the Syriac-Greek Liturgy of St James, through the Liturgies of St Basil and St Chrysostom. It dates therefore from the time of Isaac and Mesrop of the fifth century. The transubstantiation of the elements is there in effect, the officiant, however, not himself performing the miracle, but imploring God by His Spirit to perform it for him. The Hymnary

contains upward of 1800 hymns of various date, from the time of Isaac and Mesrop, Stephen of Siunik and John Mandakuni, in the fifth century, downward. It was re-edited by direction of the Synod of Tevin called in 645 by the Catholicos Nerses III, by one Basil, surnamed John, Abbot of the Monastery of Shirag, for which reason the collection came to be known as *Jonendir* (John's Selection). In the twelfth century Hachadur of Taron composed "Mystery ProFOUND," a hymn greatly prized by the Church. In the same century Nerses the Graceful revised the Hymnal, and added to it hymns of his own composition. No hymns have been added to the collection since the thirteenth century, the circumstance that the Church's devotions have been confined to the classical tongue doubtless being largely responsible for this. The Ritual is called *Mashtotz*, from a title given to Mesrop of the fifth century, traditional author of it, or perhaps from a ninth century editor, which Zarbhanelian judges impossible (see his *History of Armenian Literature*, Venice, 1865, pp 401 f.). It is the Church's handbook of special services, baptism, marriage, and burial.

11(p. 50). Elliott (Mabel): *Beginning again at Ararat*. New York, 1924, p 29.

12(p. 78). An illustration of this attitude may be found in recent history. After the 1915 massacres and deportations, someone, it was reported, interceded with Enver Pasha in behalf of some Armenians for the public service, representing them as friendly. "They cannot be friendly to us," replied Enver, "after what we have done to them." In a relentless war against Christendom no quarter is given or asked. Ormanian's explanation of Arab barbarity toward Susan Gamsaragan is that her kindness to Moslems had made her a Moslem, and her subsequent life as a Christian rendered her an apostate subject to the death penalty. See Ormanian (M.): *National History*, Constantinople, 1912, vol. i., col. 807. The explanation seems rather far-fetched. Or is it an indirect way of saying the same thing?

13(p. 97). Fortescue (A.): *The orthodox Eastern Church*. London, 1929, p 354.

14(p. 97). Zarbhanelian (G.): *History of Armenian Literature*. Venice, 1878, pp 222 ff.

15(p. 103). How much credence may be accorded these aspersions may be judged in the light cast by E. B. Tylor in his *Primitive Culture*, London, 1929, vol. i., p 77, upon a certain account of John of Otzun. Tylor cites John in the well-known statement that the Paulicians "mix wheaten flour with the blood of infants and therewith celebrate their communion, and 'when they have slain by the worst of deaths a boy, the first-born of his mother, thrown from hand to hand among them by turns, they venerate him in whose hand the child expires, as having attained to the first dignity of the sect.'" To which Tylor adds: "To explain the correspondence of these atrocious details with the nursery sport (sc., that described by the writer on the previous page of his book), it is perhaps the most likely supposition, not that the game of 'Petit Bonhomme' keeps up a recollection of a legend of the Boni Homines (i.e., the Cathari or Albigenses), but that the game was known to the children of the eighth century much as it is now, and that the Armenian Patriarch simply accused the Paulicians of playing at it with live babes."

16(p. 113). The sun-worshippers had a different pedigree, namely, Parsee, or even Egyptian sun-worship. They are called by the Armenians "children of the sun."

17(p. 117). Conybeare, op. cit., text p 39 f., translation p 103.

18(p. 117). Ibid., text p 44, trans. pp 106 f.

19(p. 118). Ibid., text p 55, trans. p 116.

20(p. 118). *Ibid.*, text p 56, trans. p 117.

21(p. 125). "The Armenian Church" "is not Monophysite, but Cyrillian." Harnack (A.): *History of Dogma*, Boston, 1898, vol. iv., p 227, note. Cf p 252, note 1.

22(p. 128). Schaff (P.): *History of the Christian Church*. New York, 1923, vol. iii., pp 752, 755.

23(p. 128). Ormanian, op. cit., vol. i., col. 572.

24(p. 129). On Justinian's order, see Schaff, op. cit., vol. iii., p 280. Dr. Loetscher refers me to Gieseler, *Church History*, Ed. 1848, vol. ii., p 128, note 24, and to Justinian's *Codex*, I, iv., 29. On the Easter Cycle, the reader may consult, Kidd (B.J.): *A history of the Church to A.D. 461*. Oxford, 1922, vol. i., p 378, and the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th Ed., Articles Calendar, Easter, and Paschal Chronicle.

25(p. 137). Mingana (A.): *The work of Dionysius Barsalibi against the Armenians*. Cambridge, 1931, p 39.

26(p. 137). The Armenian *muron* or *chrism* is compounded of olive-oil and balsam and incense, together with the essence of forty species of fragrant flowers, all boiled together in wine, and strained. Cf. Ormanian, op. cit., vol. i., col. 620.

27(p. 137). Mingana, op. cit., p 38.

28(p. 162). Smith (E.): *Researches of Smith and Dwight in Armenia*. Boston, 1833, vol. ii., p 63.

29(p. 186). Ormanian, op. cit., vol. ii., col. 2029.

30(p. 187). "There was indirect trade with China through the intermediation of the Hellenized Bactrian kingdom, though it was not until towards the end of the second century that a Roman embassy (probably some merchant adventurers who gave themselves out to be an official body) penetrated to the court of China itself." Halliday (W.R.): *The pagan background of early Christianity*. Liverpool, 1925, p 98.

31(p. 188). *Decline and fall of the Roman empire*, chap. 49.

32(p. 194). Spinka (M.): *A history of Christianity in the Balkans*. Chicago, 1933, pp 160, 182 f.

33(p. 199). Conybeare (F.C.): *Rituale Armenorum*. Oxford, 1905, p 297, note.

34(p. 200). Burchard of Mt Sion, *Library of the Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society*, vol. xii., Tr by Aubrey Stewart, London, 1896, pp 107-11.

35(p. 202). Levonian (L.): *Studies in the relationship between Islam and Christianity*. London, 1940, pp 79 ff.

36(p. 202). See above, p 78.

37(p. 203). "At least in Africa, the Mohammedan shows little repugnance to paganism and is prepared to allow many departures from orthodox Islam. The demands upon the convert, therefore, are far from exacting. Not merely is no inner change of heart expected, but even his outward habits and moral ideas need but few immediate alterations." Islam "works with the grain; it concedes much to the low human nature it finds and demands but little." Addison (J.T.): *The Christian approach to the Moslem*. New York, 1942, pp 261, 279.

38(p. 209). Ormanian, op. cit., vol. ii., col. 2154.

39(p. 211). *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th Ed., Cambridge, 1911, vol. xxi., p 232. Dr. Buckler furnishes me this note: "E. G. Browne, *Persian Literature in modern times (1580-1924)*, Cambridge, 1924, gives a very different picture of Shah Abbas, see particularly pp 108-9 for his atrocious severity."

40(p. 214). See above, p 175.

41(p. 216). The usage did not originate with the Armenians and has been

widespread. The following from Conybeare is illuminating: "In ancient Lycia there was a local cult of Zeus Sebazios, whom the Jewish colonists of that part of Asia Minor identified with the God of Sabaoth on account of the similarity of title. This cult spread westwards in the Roman epoch, and with it the ritual use, perhaps for healing purposes, of votive arms and hand. The arm is given from the elbow downwards, and the hand and fingers exactly reproduce the gesture made by a Greek orthodox priest in the act of blessing. It is supposed that it was through Jewish channels that this gesture came into the Christian Church. In the Middle Ages metal reliquaries, to contain the remains of saints, were made exactly on this device; and these may have been used to point off or avert demonic agencies and influence." See his *Myth, magic, and morals*. London, 1909, p 324. Cf Ormanian, op. cit., vol. ii., cols. 2141 f.

42(p. 236). Arpee (L.): *The Armenian awakening*. Chicago, 1909, p 18.

43(p. 248). Ormanian, op. cit., vol. iii., col. 3698.

44(p. 250). Ibid., vol. iii., col. 5384.

45(p. 250). Arpee, op. cit., pp 192 f.

46(p. 251). Ibid., p 18, note.

47(p. 285). Arpee, op. cit., pp 150 ff.

48(p. 286). Ormanian, op. cit., vol. ii., col. 2979.

49(p. 286). Ibid., vol. ii., col. 3124.

50(p. 288). See above, p 271.

51(p. 292). Knight (E.F.): *The awakening of Turkey*. London, 1909, pp 84 f.

52(p. 293). See above, p 188.

53(p. 306). See Horton (G.): *The blight of Asia*. Indianapolis, 1926, p 236.

54(p. 306). "Have not the Armenians, just because the conception of Christian solidarity has become so sadly weakened, been basely and cravenly abandoned to the fate of assassination?" Kuyper (A.): *Calvinism*. Grand Rapids, 1931, p 297. The writer is the Dutch theologian and statesman.

55(p. 307). Here is a somberer side of the picture: "The Armenians suffered worst of all. They have now only nine parishes in the whole Union." But the writer adds: "The old Bolshevik generation, who inspired the persecution, is dead, and the new generation has no hatred for the Church." Bolshakoff (S.): *The Christian Church and the soviet state*. London, 1942, pp 61, 67.

56(p. 309). Villari (L.): *Fire and sword in the Caucasus*. London, 1906, pp 188 ff. To use a private grudge to spite a race does not seem to be confined to any one time or clime. Not many years ago in this country an American cheated in a rug deal penalized the entire Armenian community by placing it under the necessity of providing the Supreme Court of the United States at great expense legal proof that they were not "Asiatics"!

57(p. 309). *The Missionary Herald*, Boston, May, 1909, p 214.

58(p. 310). Huntington (E.): *The character of races*. New York, 1924, p 146.

59(p. 311). Ramsay (W.M.): *Impressions of Turkey during twelve years' wanderings*. New York, 1897, p 217.

60(p. 312). *The Missionary Herald*, Boston, March, 1921, p 104.

61(p. 313). Ussher (C.D.): *An American physician in Turkey*. Boston, 1917, pp 288 ff.

62(p. 314). Ibid., pp 282 ff.

63(p. 314). See above, pp 201 ff.

64(p. 316). Toynbee (A.J.): *Turkey: A past and a future*. New York, 1917, pp 41 f.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. ANTHROPOLOGY

- Frazer (J. G.): *The Golden Bough. A study in magic and religion.* Macmillan, London, 1923.
- Moret (A.) & Davy (G.): *From tribe to empire.* Knopf, New York, 1926.
- Perry (W. J.): *The children of the sun.* Methuen, London, 1923.
- Smith (G. E.): *The migrations of early culture.* University Press, Manchester, 1929.
- Tylor (E. B.): *Primitive culture.* Murray, London, 1929. 2 vols.

2. ARCHAEOLOGY

- Conybeare (F. C.): *Myth, magic, and morals. A study of Christian origins.* Watts, London, 1909.
- Cumont (F.): *The mysteries of Mithra.* Tr by T. J. McCormack. Open Court, Chicago, 1903.
- Rogers (R. W.): *Cuneiform parallels to the Old Testament.* Abingdon, New York, 1926.

3. HISTORY OF RELIGIONS

- Hopkins (E. W.): *The history of religions.* Macmillan, New York, 1928.
- MacCulloch (J. A.): *Comparative theology.* Methuen, London, 1902.
- Menzies (A.): *History of religion.* Scribners, New York, 1917.
- Moore (G. F.): *History of religions.* Scribners, New York, 1914, 1920. 2 vols.
- Soper (E. D.): *The religions of mankind.* Abingdon, New York, 1938.

4. NEAR EAST HISTORY

- Aslan (K.): *Armenia and the Armenians.* Macmillan, New York, 1920.
- Christensen (A.): *L'Iran sous les Sassanides.* Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 1936.
- Creasy (E. S.): *History of the Ottoman Turks.* Holt, New York, 1878.
- Gibbon (E.): *The history of the decline and fall of the Roman empire.* In various editions.

- Laurent (J.): *L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam depuis la conquête Arabe jusqu'en 886*. Fontemoing, Paris, 1919.
- Oman (C. W. C.): *The Byzantine empire*. Putnams, New York, 1892.
- Runciman (S.): *Byzantine civilisation*. Arnold, London, 1936.

5. THE EASTERN CHURCH

- Adeney (W. F.): *The Greek and eastern churches*. Scribners, New York, 1908.
- Fortescue (A.): *The orthodox eastern church*. Catholic Truth Society, London, 1929.
- Kidd (B. J.): *A history of the Church to A.D. 461*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1922. 3 vols. *The churches of eastern Christendom from A.D. 451 to the present time*. Faith Press, London, 1927.

6. THE ARMENIAN CHURCH

- Arpee (L.): *The Armenian awakening*. University Press, Chicago, 1909.
- Chamchean (M.): *Armenian History*. Venice, 1784-86. 3 vols. (Anc. Arm.).
- Chamich (M.): *History of Armenia*. Tr by Johannes Avdall. Bishop's College Press, Calcutta, 1827. 2 vols. (Abridgment of foregoing in Eng.).
- Ormanian (M.): *The Church of Armenia*. Tr by Marcar-Gregory. Mowbray, London, 1912. *National History, Constantinople and Jerusalem, 1912, 1914, 1927*. 3 vols. (Mod. Arm.).

7. DOCTRINE

- Arpee (L.): *The atonement in experience*. Allen-Unwin, London, 1932.
- Harnack (A.): *History of dogma*. Tr by Neil Buchanan. Little-Brown, Boston, 1897-98. vols. 3 and 4.
- Luce (A. A.): *Monophysitism past and present*. Christian Knowledge, London, 1920.
- Mackintosh (H. R.): *The doctrine of the person of Jesus Christ*. Scribners, New York, 1912.
- Mingana (A.): *The work of Dionysius Barsalibi against the Armenians*. Heffer, Cambridge, 1931.
- Ottley (R. L.): *The doctrine of the Incarnation*. Methuen, London, 1896. 2 vols.
- Tekeyan (P.): *Controverses christologiques en Arméno-Cilicie dans*

- la seconde moitié du xii-me siècle. Institute of Oriental Studies, Rome, 1939.
- Wigram (W. A.): The separation of the Monophysites. Faith Press, London, 1923.

8. LITURGY

- Brightman (F. E.): Liturgies Eastern and Western. Clarendon, Oxford, 1896. vol. i.
- Conybeare (F. C.): Rituale Armenorum. Clarendon, Oxford, 1905.
- Neale (J. M.) & Littledale (R. F.): The liturgies of SS. Mark, James, Clement, Chrysostom and Basil. Hayes, London, 1869.
- Srawley (J. H.): The early history of the liturgy. University Press, Cambridge, 1913.
- Torossian (A.): The divine liturgy, according to the rites of the Holy Apostolic Church of Armenians. Gotchnag Press, New York, 1933.

9. FESTIVALS

- Boettiger (L. A.): Armenian legends and festivals. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1920.
- Hamilton (M.): Greek saints and their festivals. Blackwood, Edinburgh, 1910.

10. ARCHITECTURE AND ART

- Dalton (O. M.): Byzantine art and archaeology. Clarendon, Oxford, 1911. East Christian art. 1925.
- Hamilton (J. A.): Byzantine architecture and decoration. Batsford, London, 1933.
- Strzygowski (J.): Origin of Christian church art. Tr by Dalton & Braunholtz. Clarendon, Oxford, 1923.

11. ADVERSE MOVEMENTS

a. Mithraism

- Halliday (W. R.): The pagan background of early Christianity. University Press, Liverpool, 1925.
- Patterson (L.): Mithraism and Christianity. University Press, Cambridge, 1921.
- Phythian-Adams (W. J.): Mithraism. Constable, London, 1915.

b. Parseeism

- Jackson (A. V. W.): Zoroastrian studies. Columbia, New York, 1928.
- Modi (J. J.): The religious ceremonies and customs of the Parsees. Karani, Bombay, 1937.

Moulton (J. H.): *Early Zoroastrianism*. Williams-Norgate, London, 1913.

c. Manichaeism

Burkitt (F. C.): *The religion of the Manichees*. University Press, Cambridge, 1925.

Jackson (A. V. W.): *Researches in Manichaeism with special reference to the Turfan fragments*. Columbia, New York, 1932.

d. Western Paganism

Glover (T. R.): *The conflict of religions in the early Roman empire*. Methuen, London, 1909.

Harnack (A.): *The mission and expansion of Christianity in the first three centuries*. Tr by James Moffatt. Putnams, New York, 1908. 2 vols.

Ramsay (W. M.): *The Church in the Roman empire before A.D. 170*. Putnams, New York, 1912.

Uhlhorn (G.): *The conflict of Christianity with heathenism*. Scribners, New York, 1901.

e. Marcionism

Knox (J.): *Marcion and the New Testament*. University Press, Chicago, 1942.

Wilson (R. S.): *Marcion: A study of a second century heretic*. Clarke, London, 1932.

f. Paulicianism

Conybeare (F. C.): *The Key of Truth*. Clarendon, Oxford, 1898.

Spinka (M.): *A History of Christianity in the Balkans*. Church History Society, Chicago, 1933.

g. Islam

Addison (J. T.): *The Christian approach to the Moslem. A historical study*. Columbia, New York, 1942.

Khadduri (M.): *The law of war and peace in Islam. A study of Muslim international law*. Luzac, London, 1940.

Levonian (L.): *Studies in the relationship between Islam and Christianity*. Allen-Unwin, London, 1940.

Syed (A.): *The spirit of Islam*. Christophers, London, 1922.

h. Communism

Berdyaev (N.): *The origin of Russian communism*. Centenary Press, London, 1937.

- Bolshakoff (S.): *The Christian church and the Soviet state*. Christian Knowledge, London, 1942.
- Hecker (J. F.): *Religion and communism*. Chapman-Hall, London, 1933.
- Webb (S. & B.): *Soviet communism: A new civilization?* Scribners, New York, 1937. 2 vols.
- Yeghenian (A. Y.): *The red flag at Ararat*. Woman's Press (Gotchnag), New York, 1932.

12. THE YOUNG TURK MOVEMENT

- Abbott (G. F.): *Turkey in transition*. Arnold, London, 1909.
- Knight (E. F.): *The awakening of Turkey*. Milne, London, 1909.
- Midhat (A. H.): *The life of Midhat Pasha*. Murray, London, 1903.

13. THE ARMENIAN ATROCITIES

- Bryce (J.): *The treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman empire 1915-16*. Stationery Office, London, 1916.
- Gibbons (H.): *The red rugs of Tarsus. A woman's record of the Armenian massacre of 1909*. Century, New York, 1917.
- Greene (F. D.): *The Armenian crisis in Turkey. The massacre of 1894*. Putnams, New York, 1895.
- Harris (J. R.): *Letters from the scenes of the recent massacres in Armenia*. Revell, New York, 1897.
- Villari (L.): *Fire and sword in the Caucasus*. Unwin, London, 1906.

14. WAR-TIME BOOKS

- Elliott (M.): *Beginning again at Ararat*. Revell, New York, 1924.
- Horton (G.): *The blight of Asia*. Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, 1926.
- Knapp (G.): *The Tragedy of Bitlis*. Revell, New York, 1919.
- Morgenthau (H.): *Ambassador Morgenthau's story*. Doubleday, New York, 1918.
- Toynbee (A. J.): *The western question in Greece and Turkey*. Houghton-Mifflin, Boston, 1922.

15. THE ARMENIAN QUESTION

- Hacopian (A. P.): *Armenia and the War*. Doran, New York, 1917.
- Hepworth (G. H.): *Through Armenia on horseback*. Dutton, New York, 1898.
- McColl (M.): *England's responsibility toward Armenia*. Longmans, London, 1895.
- Papazian (B.): *The tragedy of Armenia*. Pilgrim Press, Boston, 1918.

16. MISSIONS TO THE NEAR EAST

- Barton (J. L.): Daybreak in Turkey. Pilgrim Press, Boston, 1908.
 Eddy (D. B.): What next in Turkey? American Board, Boston, 1913.
 Greene (J. K.): Leavening the Levant. Pilgrim Press, Boston, 1916.
 Richter (J.): A history of Protestant missions in the Near East. Revell, New York, 1910.
 Shaw (P. E.): American contacts with the Eastern Churches, 1820-1870. Church History Society, Chicago, 1937.
 Ussher (C. D.): An American physician in Turkey. Houghton-Mifflin, Boston, 1917.

17. EDUCATION

- Sarafian (K. A.): History of education in Armenia. Author, Van Nuys, Cal., 1930.
 Washburn (G.): Fifty years in Constantinople and recollections of Robert College. Houghton-Mifflin, Boston, 1909.

18. TRAVEL

- Buxton (N. & H.): Travel and politics in Armenia. Macmillan, New York, 1914.
 Lynch (H. F. B.): Armenia. Travels and studies. Longmans, London, 1901. 2 vols.
 Ramsay (W. M.): Impressions of Turkey during twelve years' wanderings. Putnams, New York, 1897.
 Ross (F. A.), Fry (C. L.) and Sibley (E.): The Near East and American philanthropy. Columbia, New York, 1929.
 Smith (E.): Researches of Smith and Dwight in Armenia. Crocker, Boston, 1833. 2 vols.

19. ARMENIANS IN AMERICA

- Armenian Mirror-Spectator, The. A Weekly. 42 East 23rd Street, New York City
 Dikijian (T. A.): The Armenian citizenship test-case. Compiled from official records. Gotchnag Press, New York, 1925. (In Arm. only.)
 Malcom (M. V.): The Armenians in America. Pilgrim Press, Boston, 1919.

20. REFERENCE WORKS

- Dwight (H. O.) & Bliss (E. M.): The Encyclopaedia of Missions. 2nd Ed. Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 1904.

- Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th Edition. University Press, Cambridge, 1910-11. 28 vols., and Index.
- Hastings (J.): Encyclopaedia of religion and ethics. Scribners, New York, 1917-22. 12 vols., and Index.
- Smith (W.) & Wace (H.): A dictionary of Christian biography, literature, sects and doctrines. Murray, London, 1877-87. 4 vols.

INDICES

I. GENERAL INDEX

- Abcar of Tocat, 216
 Abdallah (commander), 77
 Abdurrahim (commander), 75
 Abel the Syrian, 25
 Abirad, 136
 Ablahatian, 281
 Abu Said (commander), 82
 Abul Gharib the Armenian, 134
 Abul Vard, Emir, 320
 Acampsis, 51
 Acts of Archelaus, 13
 Adoptionism, 9ff., 105
 Afghan invasions, 236f.
 Agathangelus, 16, 58
 Agn, 95
 Ahriman, 69
 Akhurian, 6, 83. See *Arpachai*.
 Al, 8
 Albania, 47f., 53
 Albigenses, 10
 Alexander the Great, 6
 Alexandropol (Leninakan), 303ff.
 Alishan, 4
 Alphabets, Armenian, 25ff.; Georgian
 and Albanian, 28
 Amanus, 135
 Amara, 108
 American Bible Society, 276
 American Board, 114, 266, 271, 274,
 276f., 282ff., 290ff., 299, 302
 Amida, 19
 Anahita, 4f., 7, 15, 17
 Anak, 15
 Ananias of Nareg, 98, 110, 139, 320,
 324
 Anatolius, 29
 Anchoritism, 19
 Andranik, 296, 298, 304
 Angl, 47
 Angora churches, 254, 257
 Ani, 83, 85ff., 93, 95f., 134, 140, 195,
 204
 Animism, 2
 Anthimus of Tyana, 14
 Antioch, 14
 Apghazes, 85ff.
 Aphrodite, 5f.
 Apollinaris, 122, 336, 338
 Arabgir, 95
 Aramazd (Ahura Mazda), 4, 17, 69
 Ararat, 3, 15, 48, 75, 77
 Araxes, 49
 Ardaz plain, 49
 Ardžruni, Vahan, 50
 Ardžrunians, 80f.
 Argacum, 107f.
 Arghutian, 245
 Arianism, 11, 13f.
 Arius, 120f., 332, 336
 Arlez, 8
 Armavira, 5f., 48
 Armen, Shah, 195
 Armenia, 4; Dismemberment of, 23
 Armenian character, 309ff.; Creed, 122,
 133f., 142f., 159; doctrine and usage,
 141, 159f.; Era, 128; ethnology, 1;
 language, 1; revolution, 296; sta-
 tistics, 307; volunteers, 300, 305
 Armenians, 4; in America, 316f.
 Arpachai (see *Akhurian*), 303
 Arroll, 303f., 316
 Arsacides, 44; of Armenia, 6, 15, 30
 Artashir (commander), 91
 Artavastes, 8
 Artaxata, 5, 15, 17, 45, 48f., 56
 Artemas, 9
 Artemid, 5
 Artemis (Diana), 5f.
 Aryan religion, 1f.
 Ashot Bagratuni (governor), 79f.
 Ashtishat, 5, 17f., 21, 32
 Astlik (Stella), 5
 Astrology, 69
 Athanasius, 121f., 331, 333, 349
 Atropatene, 19, 47, 84, 162
 Attis and Cybele, 4
 Augustine, 10
 Avarair (battle), 49f.
 Avedis (priest), 195
 Avesta, 5f., 69
 Ayas, 157f., 160
 Babak, 81
 Babylas, 26
 Bagabert, 195
 Bagarad Bagratuni, 81
 Bagavan, 18
 Bagdad, 79f.
 Bagratides, 44, 79
 Baiiu (general), 205
 Baik, 8
 Balian, 258
 Baptism, 7, 12f.
 Barda, 49, 80

- Barsalibi, 136f.
 Barsamina, 17
 Bartholomew, 9; of Bologna, 157f.
 Basil of Cesarea, 14, 21, 97, 122, 189, 330, 332f., 335, 348
 Behistun Inscription, 4
 Bel, 52
 Ber, 85f.
 Bezjian, 239f., 251, 258, 261ff.
 Bibars (Fundukdar), 152, 205
 Bible translations, 250f.
 Bibles, Armenian, 32ff., 58; Kurdish (New Testament), 281; Turkish, 290
 Bilarghu (general), 155
 Bitlis, 156
 Black Death, 160f.
 Bogha (commander), 82
 Bogomiles, 10, 110
 Bolsheviks, 303
 Borboritac, 10f.
 Bouillon, 306
 Boyajian, Murad, 297
 Braves, 8
 Brest-Litovsk Treaty, 303
 Briand, 305f.
 Bulgars, 6
 Bulwer, 290
 Burchard, 152, 199f.
 Byzantine policy, 96f.

 Cadesia (battle), 75
 Canning (Lord Redcliffe), 269, 364f.
 Capitulations, 299
 Carchemish (battle), 3
 Caspian Gate (Derbent), 19, 44
 Cathari, 10
 Catholicate, The, 200f., 211, 213f., 216f., 307; in the Amanus, 96; at Sis, 137, 141, 153; at Valarshabad, 83; at Zamanta, 96, 135
 Catholicates, Aghtamar, 85, 216; Albania, 80, 216; Bzommar (Papal), 263; Sis, 175
 Catholici, Rival, 135
 Caucasian Federation, 303
 Caucasus, Conditions in, 298
 Chardin, 162
 Chilingirian, 288
 Christian Associations, 270
 Christmas, 7, 12
 Chrysocheir, 92, 106, 108
 Church Books, 30
 Churches, Orientation of, 7
 Cilicia, Post-war, 305f.
 Commagene, 3
 Compact of Gregory with Sylvester, 150, 216
 Conrad of Mainz, 149
 Constantine of Mananali, 103, 106
 Constantinople, 226ff.; captured by Latins, 150; Conference, 295
 Constitution, Armenian, 248; Turkish, 294f.
 Controversies, Greek, 87
 Conybeare, 9, 12f., 114, 319
 Corycus, 161
 Council of Armenian Missions, 278
 Council of Florence, 163
 Councils, Ecumenical, 11, 120ff.; Ephesus, 12, 31, 102; Nicaea, 10, 105; Second of Nicaea, 90
 Counter-reformation, 286ff.
 Crusades, First, 135; Second, 139; Third, 149; Eighth, 152
 Ctesiphon, 45, 51
 Cyprus, 157
 Cyprus Convention, 295f., 317
 Cyril of Alexandria, 123f., 328

 Dajaz (governor), 55
 Damadian, 297
 Daniel the Syrian, 25f.
 Dara, 56f.
 Dashnakists, 288
 Datev, 195
 David of Carni, 196f.; Saharuni, 75; of Tevin, 77
 Denshapur, 45
 Deportations, 300ff., 307, 315
 Diana of the Ephesians, 4
 Diarbekir, Peace of, 211
 Diodorus of Tarsus, 123
 Dionysius of Alexandria, 9, 13
 Dioscurus, 124
 Disintegration, Political, 88
 Doctrine (see *Armenian doctrine and usage*), 268, 325ff.; Anthropology, 178; atonement, 181ff.; authorities, 257; baptism, 74, 184 (see also *Baptism*); Christ, passion, 61ff., 181ff., 333ff., 342ff.; Christ, person, 101, 180f. (see *Monophysitism*); Christ, work, 349ff.; Church, 183; Communion, 184f.; eschatology, 185; faith, 64, 179f.; fasting, 64; fate, 69f.; foreordination, 177; freedom, 63, 66f., 70, 178; God, 66, 70f.; good works, 64; hell, 65; heresies, 62f.; Holy Spirit, 122, 183; idolatry, 67, 70ff.; Incarnation, 60, 326f., 331ff., 336, 338; miracles, 61; missions, 62; Monophysitism, 12, 60, 125, 127f., 180f., 325, 327ff., 331ff., 336ff.; penances, 325; repentance,

- 63f.; sacraments, 184ff.; saints, 62, 65; Satan, 67; sin, 66f., 72, 74, 178f., 350ff.; soteriology, 181ff.; Theopaschitism, 126ff., 181; Trinitarianism, 15, 59f., 339ff.
- Duzians, 257f.
- Dwight, 266
- Dzovk (Dlouk), 136
- Easter, 153; Easter cycle, 129
- Ebionitism, 9, 20
- Edict of Toleration, 15
- Education, 19; clerical, 241, 278
- Educational institutions, Academy of Oriental Languages, 236, 241; Academy, Patriarchal, 240f., 266; American mission schools, 241, 267; Central College, 241; Etchmiadzin Seminary, 287; Jerusalem monastic school, 241; National College at Scutari, 241; Nersesian Academy, 241; Parish schools, 240; Protestant Education, 275f.; Sanassarian College, 241
- Egyptian invasions, 157, 159ff.
- Elisaeus, 45, 53
- Emigration, 213, 277f., 282, 293f.
- Emin, 236
- Emirs, Arab, 86
- Ephraim Syrus, 328
- Ephthalites (White Huns), 46ff., 51f., 54f.
- Epicureans, 71
- Epiphanius of Cyprus, 10, 26, 105
- Erazamuyun, 17
- Eritzian, 114
- Eriza, 5, 17
- Erzurum, 4, 95, 113. See *Theodosiopolis*.
- Esaïas, Abbot, 158
- Etchmiadzin, 5, 18, 54, 94, 114, 201, 208ff., 246
- Eusebius of Caesarea in Cappadocia, 21; of Caesarea in Palestine, 9, 13; of Nicomedia, 121
- Eustathius of Sebastea, 21, 97
- Eutyches, 124, 132, 327, 331, 333, 336, 338, 343
- Evangelization, 250f.
- Extreme unction, 259f.
- Eznik, 31, 45, 66f.
- Ferriol, 233ff.
- Five points, The, 256, 258
- Fort Ani (Kemakh), 6, 17, 91
- Fortescue, 97
- Frazer, 2
- Galanus, 227
- Gamsaragan, Susan, 78
- Garabed of Erzurum, 240
- Garin (Erzurum) province, 131
- Gegnesius, 107
- George of Julfa, 236
- Georgians (Iberians), 20, 46, 129
- Germanicia (Marash), 14, 102, 110
- Giragos of Trebizond, 218f.
- Giragos Vartabed, 355
- Goodell, 266
- Gorun, 27, 31
- Greek demands, 144, 147f.
- Gregorian, Vertanes Esmak, 267
- Gregorius (Catholicos of Albania), 20
- Gregory, of Datev, 175ff., 206, 214, 243; Magistros, 94f., 99, 105, 108, 111f., 135; of Nareg, 95, 98, 112, 134, 165ff., 319; Nazianzen, 122, 180f., 339, 347, 350; of Nyssa, 178, 346
- Guignard, 255f.
- Gundzik, 109
- Hachadur of Caesarea, 235, 242
- Hamlin, 267, 275
- Harbord, Gen., 304
- Hasunian, 263f.
- Hatti Humayun, 249, 290, 293; Sherif of Gulhané, 248, 293
- Her province, 48
- Hercules, 2, 6
- Herodotus, 1
- Hittites, 1, 3
- Holy Cross Cathedral, 93f.
- Hospitals, 239
- Hranush, 109
- Huntington, 310
- Hyacinth, 231
- Hymnary, 126f.
- Ibrahim, 267
- Immortals, 50
- Infidelity, 285f.
- Invitation to Love*, 259f.
- Isaac of Rushdunik, 51, 53
- Ishtar, 5
- Isidore of Seville, 175f.
- Jacob of Datev, 94; of Harck, 108f.; Zanzalus (Baradai), 132, 331, 336
- Jacobites, 136
- Janissaries, 210, 260f.
- Jesuit missions, 229, 290
- Jews, 251, 270
- Johanianz, 355
- John of Carni, 158f.; the Englishman, 158; of Erznga, 214; of Julfa, 235f.,

- 251; Mairacomensis, 105; Uman of Philippopolis, 142; "Vanagan," 194; of Vorodn, 175, 243
 Jonan, Vartan, 226
 Joslin de Courtenay, 136
 Joslin III, 141
 Jrga, 105, 108
 Julfa, 49, 212
 Julian Calendar, 136
 Julian of Halicarnassus, 105, 132, 333, 336
 Jwurm (see *Tchévirmé*), 108
 Karbeas, 107f.
 Kars, 83, 95, 204
 Kemal, 305
 Kesun, 135, 141, 174
 Keumurjian, Comitas, 235; Jeremias, 251
 Keuprulu, 228
 Khaltia, 3
 Khaltis, 3f.
 Khazar, 76
 Khnus, 108, 113
 Khosrov, Bishop, 134
 Khuzistan, 46
 Kimball, Dr., 299
 Kupelian, 264
 Kur River, 48, 85
 Kurdish mission, 280f.
 Kushana, 44f.
 Lazar of Pharbee, 10f.
 Lazarian, 251
 Lemberg, 224ff.
 Leontius of Cesarea, 15, 17
 Leontius, priest, 47, 50f., 53
 London Conference, 299
 Lusignan, House of, 160
 Macarius of Jerusalem, 13, 20
 Macarius, monk, 98
 Magnates, 248f.
 Mamigonian, David, 81; Gregory, 82; Vahan, 11, 54f.; Vartan, 28f., 31, 45, 47, 48ff., 189; Vartan the Younger, 56f.
 Mananali, 106, 109, 111
 Manazkert (Manzikert), 96, 108; battle of, 96, 134
 Mani, 102ff.
 Manichaeism, 58f., 68, 102ff., 336f., 341
 Manuel, Adviser, 92; architect, 93; commander, 81; priest, 254
 Manuelian, 263
 Maragha, 158
 Marash, 141, 160. See *Germanicia*.
 Marcionism, 72ff., 337
 Marcus, Bishop, 140
 Martyn, 246
 Martyropolis (Mufarkin or Farkin), 106, 109, 201
 Martyrs, Modern, 361ff.
 Massacres, 282, 292ff., 297, 305
 Massilianism, 11f.
 Maximin Daza, 16
 Mayaguil, 4
 Mazdaicism, 46f. See *Parseism* and *Zoroastrianism*.
 Mekhitar Petrossian, 231f.
 Mekhitarists, 259, 261
 Melchior Dasbas, 234
 Melchizedek of Erivan, 222
 Melik Ashraf (commander), 153
 Melik, Emir of Aleppo, 161
 Melik al Nasir, 156
 Melitene (Malatia), 1, 56, 107, 110
 Merujan, 9, 13
 Mesrop, 10, 24ff., 58
 Messalianism, 10ff., 191
 Michael of Bergnik, 234
 Midhat Pasha, 294f.
 Mihr Nerseh, 45, 49
 Mihr Shabouh, 30
 Militarism, 189
 Missionary rights, 267, 291
 Missions, Failure of, 201ff.
 Missions Aid, 275
 Mitannians, 4
 Mithra, 4, 7, 17
 Mjej Knuni, 55
 Mok (Magians), 7
 Monasteries, Abragounik, 175; Datev, 93f., 175, 219; Gjav, 319; Medzob, 175; Nareg, 98; New Julfa, 235f.; St. Catherine, 355; St. John Baptist of Bitlis, 240; the Sts. James of Jerusalem, 256
 Monasticism, 21, 23, 45, 58, 97f., 288f.
 Moscheti, 19f. See *Albania*.
 Moslem work, 289f.
 Mt. Aracadz (Alageuz), 20
 Mt. Athos, 98
 Mt. Masis (Ararat), 8, 188, 215
 Mt. Nbad (Ala Dagħ), 18, 22
 Muddy River, 49
 Mush District, 5, 188, 293
 Mushegh (Paulician), 320f., 323
 Mushgan Nusalavoord, 49f.
 Nakhichevan, 75, 78, 82, 94, 96, 159, 206
 Nana, 17

- Narod, 7, 184
 Nasir Mohammed of Egypt, 160
 Nasr, governor of Tevin, 85
 Navarino (sea battle), 262
 Nazarbegian, Gen., 303
 Neapolis, 16, 18, 22, 25. See *Valars-habad*.
 Nehavend (battle), 75
 Neo-Cesarea, 107, 137
 Nerses Balienz, 159; Catholicos of Sis, 222; of Lambron, 145ff., 148f.
 Nestorianism, 10, 12, 31, 102, 122f., 137
 Nestorius, 14
 New Julfa, 212, 235ff., 355
 Nicene Creed, 258
 Niepage, 315
 Nine points, The, 268f.
 Nishapur, 45, 52f.
 Nisibis, 19, 56f.
 Nurijan, 263
- Okba, commander, 77f.
 Old Testament Canon, 80
 Omar, governor, 92
 Orphans, War, 302
 Osgan of Ispahan, 242f.
 Oshagan, 32
 Ottoman Dynasty, 155
- Pacaran, 83
 Pacarij, 4, 17
 Pap, 21f.
 Papal, Community recognized, 263; controversies, 226ff.; defection, 252ff.; supremacy, 150; vicar, 261
 Papists banished, 262f.
 Parseeism, 67ff. See *Mazdaeism, Zoroastrianism*.
 Parsons, 290
 Pasen province, 75, 91, 95
 Patriarchate of Constantinople, 209, 226f.; papal, 263f.
 Patriarchate of Jerusalem, 156, 238
 Paul, of Boulogne, 164; Evangelist, 220; of Samosata, 10, 14, 102f., 105, 120
 Pauliani, 10, 105
 Paulicianism, 101ff., 112ff., 320ff., 340ff.
 Paulicians, 14, 29, 92, 98, 193f., 202, 319f.
 Peripatetics, 70
 Peshitto, 25
 Peshtimaljian, 241, 266
 Peter of Aragona, 158, 175; of Astara-
 bad, 175; the Fuller, 132; Marcella, 150
 Petrus II, of Alexandria, 319
 Petrus Siculus, 105f., 110
 Phantasiasticism, 106, 325f.
 Phaustus, Bishop, 14; of Byzantium, 19
 Philanthropy, 238f., 299, 302
 Philaretus, 90, 135, 201
 Photinus, 10, 327
 Photius, 105
 Pilatus, 26
 Piromalli, 223, 225
 Platonists, 70f.
 Polojenye, 241, 244ff., 298
 Pontus, 5, 81, 96
 Porphyry, 11
 Porter, Commodore, 267
 Priests, remarriage, 287
 Printing, 235, 242ff.
 Propaganda, College of the, 164
 Protestantism, 266ff.; buildings, 272, 276; defections, 284; influence, 272ff., 285; legal status, 269; persecution, 267; personnel, 271f., 284; progress, 266f., 269f.; self-support, 281f.; significance, 279ff.; statistics, 270f., 277f., 280; and the Turkish government, 289ff.
 Pseudo-Dionysius, 176
 Pythagoreans, 70
- Rah (river), 28. See *Akhurian*.
 Ramsay, 296, 311, 316
 Recording angel, 8
 Reed, The, 2f.
 Relics, 18, 191f.
 Remposian, 48f.
 Reuben, 135
 Revivals, 270, 273
 Right Hand, The, 215f.
 Rights of Christians, under Arabs, 76, 79f., 82; in Persia, 355ff.; in Turkey, 263, 364f.
 Roman conformity proposed, 153f.
 Romgla, 136, 141f., 153, 174
 Rose festival, 7
 Rosen, 247
 Rufinus of Samosata, 26ff.
 Rusas, 3
- Saad (commander), 75
 Sacasdene, 46
 Sacrifices, Blood, 7
 Sahakian, 266f.
 Saladin, 149
 Samuel of Bulgaria, 88f.

- Sarduris II, 3
 Sargisian, 319
 Sargon II, 3
 Sassanides of Persia, 15, 75
 Sasun revolt, 297
 Scythians (Turanian), 6
 Sebastea (Sivas), 17, 29, 88, 95f.
 Semi-Pelagianism, 11f.
 Sennacherib, 3
 Sergiopolis, 57
 Sergius Baronder, 218f.; of Edessa (Urfa), 105; of Jerusalem, 156; St. Sergius, 57
 Sevan, Lake, 77, 92
 Severianus of Gabala, 347
 Shaban Ashref of Egypt, 161
 Shalmaneser III, 3
 Shamash and Ishtar, 4
 Shiragavan, 83
 Simeon of Erzurum, 159; monk, 98f.; the Nestorian, 204f.
 Sinan (architect), 210
 Sinan, Pashas, 210, 228f.
 Sis, 152, 154, 161f., 205, 207
 Sivas, 207. See *Sebastea*.
 Smbat Bagratuni, commander, 77; generalissimo, 81f.; governor, 57; Smbat Constable, 205; Smbat of Zarehavan, 108, 112, 114, 320, 322
 Smith, Eli, 266
 Smith and Dwight, 162
 Smyrna, 306
 Snake, The, 7
 Soviets, Religion under the, 307
 Stephen of Lemberg, 226
 Stoics, 71
 Suleiman, Mosque of, 210
 Sultanieh, 155, 157
 Sun-worship, 6, 44ff.
 Sunday observance, 279
 Superstitions, 7f.
 Synods, Adana, 156f.; Antioch (Latin), 139; Ashtishat, 21, 31; Barda, 80, 194; Constantinople, 129; Etchmiadzin, 246ff.; Harck, 109; Manazkert, 106, 132; Milan (Latin), 10; Romgla, 145ff.; Shahabivan, 190ff.; Shiragavan, 133; Sis, 150f., 155f., 160f., 198f.; Tevin, 106, 128, 132, 192f.; Theodosiopolis (Garin), 130f.; Valarshabad (Neapolis), 25, 189f.
 Tabriz, 130, 154
 Tamaroff, 244f.
 Taron province, 17, 24, 75, 81, 92
 Tarsus, 149
 Tatars, 204ff.
 Tchévirmé, 113f. See *Jwurm*.
 Temple prostitution, 5
 Tengerians, 262
 Tephrike (Divrik), 106, 108
 Tertullian, 9
 Testament of Shrushkan, 237
 Tevin, 54, 56f., 75, 77f., 81ff., 94, 131
 Thaddeus, 9; Bishop, 237
 Theatre, 192
 Theodore, of Antioch, 110; of Mop-suestia, 26, 31, 123, 327; Rushduni (Paulician leader), 105; of Tevin, 56
 Theodoret, 123f.
 Theodorus (commander), 56
 Theodosiopolis (Garin), 29, 56, 95, 110
 Theodotus, 9
 Theorian, philosopher, 142ff.
 Thomas of Medzob, 214
 Tiglath-Pileser II, 3
 Til, 17
 Timur, Beg (governor), 161
 Tiridates, architect, 86f.
 Tonrak, 108
 Tonrakians, 29, 108, 113, 320f. See *Paulicians*.
 Torosowitz, 224ff.
 Tortan, 17
 Tourian, Leontius, 308
 Translators, The Younger, 30ff.
 Treaty of Berlin, 295f.; of Commerce, 267; of Lausanne, 306; of San Stefano, 295
 Trinitarian controversy, 120ff.
 Tumanbey of Egypt, 209
 Turcomans, 208, 214
 Turkish revolution, 291f.
 Turks, 86, 94, 135, 139, 141, 157, 195, 204, 244
 Tyr, 17
 Uniats, 131f.
 Unitarianism, 101f., 105, 119. See *Adoptionism*, *Arianism*, *Ebionitism*.
 Unitors, 158f., 162, 175
 Urardhu, 1, 3f.
 Urumia, 5
 Ussher, Dr., 313f.
 Utch Kilissé, 18, 245
 Vahagn, 2
 Vahrij, 25
 Valarshabad, 16, 214. See *Neapolis*.
 Valentinian, 336, 341
 Van, 4f.
 Vartan of Tadvan, 214
 Vartanowitz, 226

- Vasak, 45, 47ff.; 76 (governor); 94f.,
Bahlavuni
Vaspuragan (Van), 13, 24, 75, 80ff., 94
Vatican Council, 264
Villeneuve, 253
Virkana (Hyrcania), 57
Vrverr (Paulician), 109f.
Vulgate, 25

Wailing for the dead, 66, 190ff.
Walid (governor), 106
Wars, Armeno-Turkish, 303ff.; Crimean, 293; Greco-Turkish, 305; Russo-Turkish, 263, 293, 295; World War, First, 270, 274f., 277f., 292, 299, 302, 365; Second, 307, 317
Webster, 267

Women, 53, 187
Xenophon, 3
Yezid (governor), 80
Young People's Societies, 270
Yusuf (governor), 84f.

Zarbhanelian, 97
Zarchavan, 105, 108
Zarevand province, 48
Zenobius, 188
Zervan, 6, 67ff.
Zeus, 6
Zoroaster, 5f.
Zoroastrianism, 2, 4ff., 68f. See *Mazdaicism*, *Parseeism*.

II. DIGNITARIES OF CHURCH AND STATE

- Armenian Catholics:* Alexander I, 236f. Ananias I, 85f. Aristaces, 20. Aristaces II, 224. Constantine, 150f. Constantine II, 153. Constantine III, 155f. Constantine VI, 163, 214. Daniel, 245f. David IV, 221; David of Tiflis, 245f. Eliezer I, 229. Esaias, 81. Ezras, 75, 130ff. Garabed II, of Zeitun, 252. George II, 83. George IV, 241, 286f., 288. George V, 302. Giragos I, 215. Gregory, the Illuminator, 6, 12, 14, 15ff., 58ff., 328f., 346. Gregory II, 96, 135f., 141, 325. Gregory III, 85, 136, 139, 141, 215. Gregory IV, 136, 145, 149f. Gregory VII, 153, 155. Hachadur of Sivas (See of Sis), 227. Hatchik, 88. Hatchik II, 134. Isaac, 10, 24ff., 58, 189. Isaac II (Sis), 287. Isaac III, 76ff., 319. Jacob IV, of Julfa, 211, 223, 226, 236, 242. Jacob V, 244. John Mandakuni, 11, 54f., 192. John of Otzun, 78f., 90, 106, 112, 121, 126, 132, 193, 325, 355. John V, the Historian, 84f. John VI, 134, 150. John VIII, 247. Joseph, 45, 51, 53. Khoren Muradbeian, 32, 307f. Kiud, 54. Lucas I, 244f. Macar I, 241. Mashtotz, 134. Matthew I, 249. Megr-ditch I, Khrimian, 287f., 298. Mekhitar I, 159. Melchizedek, 213, 220f., 224. Mesrop I, 159. Michael I, of Sivas, 216, 242. Moses II, 56, 129. Moses III, of Datev, 217ff., 224f. Nahabed I, 230. Nerses I, the Great, 14, 20ff., 24, 97, 189, 315. Nerses II, 55, 128. Nerses III, 75, 105, 192. Nerses IV, the Graceful, 113, 136, 138, 141, 142ff., 170ff., 197. Nerses V, of Ashdarag, 246. Philip I, 222f., 225ff., 242. Sahak (Shahak), 323. Samuel the Syrian, 32. Serapion, 211, 218. Sergius I, 108f. Shahak, 319. Simeon I, 241, 243, 255, 286. Stephen of Tevin (irregular), 81. Stephen II, 85. Stephen III, 88. Stephen IV, 153. Stephen V, 216. Surmac (irregular), 30f. Vahan I, 87f., 134. Vertanes, 20. Zecharias, 132. Zion I, 80.
Armenian Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem: Avedick, 231ff. Daniel, 245. David, 227. Ephraim, 230f. Garabed, 262. Giragos of Erivan, 227. Gregory, 221, 245f. Gregory Basmadjian, 255. Gregory of Shirwan, of the Chain (Jerusalem), 250, 253. Hachadur of Sivas, 227. Jacob, 248f. Jacob Nalyan, 240, 254f. Joachim, 209. John the Deaf, 227. John of Ganzaca, 235. John Golod, 238, 240, 243, 250, 252f. John of Smyrna, 234. Matthew I, 249, 267ff. Melchizedek, 230. Ormanian, 50, 97, 128f., 186, 241, 248, 265, 285f., 297. Paul, 248, 257ff., 261. Thomas of Aleppo, 227ff. Zecharias of Van, 227. Zecharias II, of Galzwan, 238ff., 255f.
Greek Patriarchs of Constantinople: Atticus, 10, 29. Cyril Lucar, 228. Flavian, 124f. Germanus, 107, 132. John Chrysostom, 329f., 348. Joseph, 163. Maximian, 31. Michael, 143. Photius, 132.
Popes of Rome: Benedict XII, 159f. Benedict XIII, 252. Celestine III, 149. Clement V, 156. Clement VI, 160f.

Clement XI, 234, 236. Eugenius III, 139f. Eugenius IV, 163. Felix II, 125. Gregory the Great, 192. Gregory VII, 135f. Gregory IX, 150. Gregory XIII, 164, 196. Honorius II, 139. Innocent II, 139. Innocent III, 149f. Innocent VI, 159. John XXII, 156. Julius, 121, 329. Leo I, 124f. Leo XIII, 164. Lucius II, 136. Lucius III, 150. Nicholas IV, 152. Pius VIII, 263. Urban VIII, 164, 223, 225, 227.

Kings of Armenia: Abbas Bagratuni, 85. Ardashir, 30. Arsaces, 21f., 188. Artashes I, 8. Artashes II, 6. Artashes III, 9. Ashot Bagratuni, 83. Ashot II, 84f. Ashot III, the Merciful, 86. Constantine I, of Cilicia, 154. Constantine II, 160. Constantine III, 161. Constantine IV, 161. Gagik Ardzruni, of Vaspuragan, 84f., 92, 134. Gagik of Kars, 96, 135, 140. Hamazasb Ardzruni, 88. Hetum I, of Cilicia, 151f., 205. Hetum II, 152ff. John, King of Ani, 95. Khosrov, 9, 15. Khosrov III, 24, 28. Leo (Prince) I, of Cilicia, 140. Leo II, 148f. Leo III, 152, 154, 205f. Leo IV, 154f. Leo V, 158ff. Leo VI, 161. Mushegh Bagratuni, of Kars, 86. Oshin, of Cilicia, 155ff. Senekerim, of Vaspuragan, 94. Smbat Bagratuni (Prince), 81f. Smbat II, 83f., 86f. Tigranes I, 2. Tigranes III, the Great, 5, 22, 187. Tiridates, 9, 15ff. Toros I, of Cilicia, 140. Toros II, 141. Valarses, 6. Vramshabouh, 24f., 28.

Emperors of Byzantium: Alexius III, Angelus, 148f. Andronicus, 154. Artavastes (pretender), 79, 90. Basil I, 83, 92, 106, 108. Basil II, 88, 95, 110, 165. Constans II, 75f. Constantine, 121. Constantine IV, Pogonatus, 106. Constantine V, Copronymus, 79, 90, 110. Constantine VI, 90. Constantine VII, Porphyrogenitus, 84. Constantine IX, Monomachus, 111. Constantine X, Ducas, 135. Constantius, 121. Diocletian, 15. Heraclius, 75, 130. Irene, 90f. John I, Zimiscus, 110. John II, Comnenus, 140. John VI, Palaeologus, 163. Justin II, 56. Justinian, 55f., 125, 129, 187. Justinian II, 76f., 106. Leo III, the Isaurian, 90, 107. Leo IV, 90. Leo V, the Armenian, 91, 107. Licinius, 15. Manuel Comnenus, 141f. Marcian, 48,

56, 124. Maurice, 57, 129. Michael III, 92. Nicephorus I, 107. Nicephorus II, Phocas, 189. Phocas, 129. Romanus I, Lecapenus, 84, 98. Romanus IV, Diogenes, 96. Theodora, consort, 129. Theodora, regent, 92, 107. Theodosius, 22, 48, 122. Theodosius II, 29, 124. Theophilus, 81, 91. Tiberius II, 56. Valens, 23. Zen'o, 124.

Persian Rulers: Abbas, 210ff., 216ff. Artaxerxes II, Mnemon, 4. Bahram IV, 24, 29f., 32. Berosus, 53f., 187. Cyrus, 2f. Darius Hystaspis, 4. Hormizd IV, 57. Ismail, 209. Jezdegerd I, 28. Jezdegerd II, 32, 44ff. Jezdegerd III, 75. Kavadh I, 55. Khosrov I, Anushirvan, 55ff. Khosrov II, 57, 129. Nadir, 236, 244. Sapor I, 22, 46, 104. Sapor III, 24. Sufi, 215, 217, 225. Tahmasp, 210, 216. Valarsaces (Balash), 54f.

Arab Caliphs: Abdul Malik, 77. Ali, 76. Harun al Rashid, 80. Hisham, 355. Jafar, 79. Kaim, 95. Mamun, 81. Merwan II, 79. Mohammed, the Prophet, 355. Mohammed Jafar, 355. Mostasim, 205. Muavié, 76. Muktedir, 85. Mutamid, 83. Mutasim, 81. Mutawakkil Jaafar, 82f. Mutazid, 83. Omar I, 75. Omar II, 78, 355. Walid, 78. Wasik, 81.

Tatar Khans: Abu Said, 157. Ghazan, 154. Hulagu, 152, 205. Mangu, 205. Patu, 205. Timur (Tamerlane), 161f., 206f. Uljaitu, 154ff.

Turkish Sultans: Abdul Aziz, 294. Abdul Hamid II, 250, 290f., 294ff., 299. Abdul Medjid, 248, 293. Ahmed III, 233. Alp Arslan, 96. Bayezid, 162, 207. Mahmud, 239, 256, 258, 261ff., 267. Mehemmed II, the Conqueror, 208f. Mehemmed IV, 211. Murad II, 208. Murad IV, 211. Murad V, 294. Mustapha II, 233. Mustapha III, 254. Selim I, 209, 256. Suleiman the Magnificent, 210. Toghrul, 94ff.

Russian Tsars: Alexander I, 245. Anne, 244. Catherine the Great, 244. Elizabeth, 244. Nicholas I, 247. Paul, 245. Peter the Great, 244.

Westerns: Edward I, of England, 156. Edward II, 156. Frederick Barbarossa, 110, 149. Henry VI, 149. Hugo III, of Cyprus, 152. Louis XIV, of France, 234. Peter I, of Cyprus, 161. Philip the Fair, of France, 156.